

When the future historian traces Theodore Roosevelt's extraordinary career he will find these embodied ideals planted like milestones along the road over which he marched. They never left him. His ideal of public service was to be found in his life, and as his life drew to its close he had to meet his ideal of sacrifice face to face. All his sons went from him to the war and one was killed upon the field of honor. Of all the ideals that lift men up, the hardest to fulfill is the ideal of sacrifice. Theodore Roosevelt met it as he had all others and fulfilled it to the last jot of its terrible demands. His country asked the sacrifice and he gave it with solemn pride and uncomplaining lips.

This is not the place to speak of his private life, but within that sacred circle no man was ever more blessed in the utter devotion of a noble wife and the passionate love of his children. The absolute purity and beauty of his family life tell us why the pride and interest which his fellow countrymen felt in him were always touched with the warm light of love. In the home so dear to him, in his sleep, death came, and—

So Valiant-for-Truth passed over and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side.

BENEDICTION.

Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, pronounced the following benediction:

And now may the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all evermore. Amen.

ADJOURNMENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The purpose for which this joint session of the Congress of the United States this day assembled having been satisfactorily concluded, it is now adjourned.

Whereupon (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, February 10, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

Monday, February 10, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast given to us our place in the world and called us to places of responsibility at a time when the world is seeking the paths of peace and the nations are conferring with each other about the way for the establishment of justice and right among all men. We pray that we may all turn back to the ancient statutes of the Lord and may find that upon building on these we may build with security and with hope and with confidence the temple of human justice and right. Grant us willing hearts to respond to the divine command and active lives to express our consecration to the divine will. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, February 7, 1919, when, on request of Mr. SHEPARD and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12863) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 1847. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Wyoming National Forest;

H. R. 1607. An act for the relief of David E. Gray;

H. R. 12996. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio;

H. R. 12997. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio;

H. R. 13232. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Red River of the North, between Traill County, N. Dak., and Polk County, Minn.;

H. R. 13273. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insur-

ance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and an act in amendment thereto approved October 6, 1917; and H. R. 13353. An act to extend the provisions of the homestead laws touching credit for period of enlistment to the soldiers, nurses, and officers of the Army and the seamen, marines, nurses, and officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps of the United States who have served or will have served with the Mexican border operations or during the war between the United States and Germany and her allies.

SENATOR FROM NEBRASKA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following credentials of election of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], which will be read and placed on the files.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed, as follows: To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November, 1918, GEORGE W. NORRIS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Nebraska a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1919.

Witness: His excellency, our governor, S. R. McKelvie, and our seal hereto affixed at Lincoln, Nebr., this 23d day of January, A. D. 1919.

By the governor:

[SEAL.]

SAMUEL R. MCKELVIE, Governor.

D. M. AMSBERRY,
Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM ARKANSAS.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I present the credentials of my colleague [Mr. ROBINSON] and ask that they may be read and placed on the file.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the credentials.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed, as follows: To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November, 1918, JOE T. ROBINSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arkansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1919.

Witness: His excellency, our governor, Charles H. Brough, and our seal hereto affixed at Little Rock, this 5th day of February, A. D. 1919.

By the governor:

[SEAL.]

CHARLES H. BROUGH, Governor.

TOM J. TERRAL,
Secretary of State.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I purpose asking unanimous consent to call up House joint resolution 200, and preliminary to that I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LODGE. Has morning business been disposed of?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; nothing has been done.

Mr. BORAH. Does that dispense with—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Harding | Martin, Va. | Smith, S. C. |
| Baird | Henderson | Moses | Smoot |
| Bankhead | Hitchcock | Nelson | Spencer |
| Beckham | Hollis | New | Sterling |
| Borah | Johnson, Cal. | Norris | Sutherland |
| Brandegee | Johnson, S. Dak. | Nugent | Swanson |
| Caldor | Jones, N. Mex. | Overman | Thomas |
| Cole | Jones, Wash. | Pago | Thompson |
| Culherson | Kellogg | Penrose | Townsend |
| Cummins | Kenyon | Pittman | Trammell |
| Curtis | King | Poindexter | Underwood |
| Dillingham | Kirby | Pollock | Vardaman |
| Fernald | La Follette | Pomerene | Wadsworth |
| Fletcher | Lenroot | Ransdell | Walsh |
| France | Lewis | Robinson | Warren |
| Frelinghuysen | Lodge | Saulsbury | Watson |
| Gay | McCumber | Shafroth | Williams |
| Gerry | McKellar | Sheppard | Wolcott |
| Gore | McLean | Sherman | |
| Gronna | McNary | Smith, Ga. | |
| Hale | Martin, Ky. | Smith, Mich. | |

Mr. McNARY. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] on official business.

Mr. LENROOT. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] is absent on official business.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is detained by illness.

Mr. BECKHAM. I desire to announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] is detained on official business.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SHIELDS] is detained by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It has been suggested that it would be satisfactory to the Senate to dispense with the morning business and proceed at once to the consideration of House joint resolution 200. A week ago I gave notice that on to-day the

joint resolution would be called up for consideration, and I will now ask unanimous consent that we may proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution. I will withhold the motion for a little while if any Senator has anything urgent to present.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection at all to the request the Senator is making, but there is a little morning business that I think we all wish to dispose of and would be glad to put in now—petitions and things of that sort.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then I will withhold the request for a short time.

Mr. LODGE. I am much obliged to the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have here a petition against what are known as the luxury taxes, signed by some 10,000 persons. They request to have stricken from the pending revenue bill the so-called luxury taxes, and give their reasons, which are very brief, and I shall ask to have the petition printed in the RECORD.

I merely wish to say that I am getting many letters on this subject, as well as these great petitions. I wish to state for the benefit of the petitioners that those taxes—so-called luxury taxes, most of them being on objects of prime necessity—were put in in the House while we were at war when it was necessary to raise \$8,000,000 of revenue. After the armistice the committee of the Senate struck them out, and the House was anxious to have them stricken out, looking on them only as an extreme war tax. But the Senate in its wisdom saw fit to restore them, and by restoring them put them beyond the power of the conferees. It was impossible for the conferees to take them from the bill and nothing can be done further with that bill. It may be possible to pass a joint resolution later removing them, for they are excessive taxes which ought not to remain. I send the petition to the desk and ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THE SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS FROM MASSACHUSETTS:

The undersigned consumers respectfully request that you use your votes and influence to have stricken from the pending internal-revenue bill the so-called luxury taxes.

We request this action, because these taxes are discriminatory, will be an unjust and annoying burden to the consumer, will throw out of employment many workmen engaged in manufacturing the articles taxed at a time when it would appear to be necessary to prevent unemployment and because of the fact that the Government will derive a comparatively small revenue at an exceedingly heavy cost of collection.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I simply rose to say that I have received similar petitions from nearly every institution in the State of Utah signed by the employees of all the dry-goods and grocery stores of that State. I am not going to present them to the Senate, because they are of a character similar to those already presented and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition adopted at a meeting of 1,000 citizens of Brookline, Mass., under the auspices of the Brookline Civic Forum, and a petition of sundry members of the National Academy of Sciences, praying for the creation of a league of nations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the Rotary Club of Lynn, Mass., praying for the return to private ownership of the telephone and telegraph lines, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Local Union 1A, Telephone Operators' Union, of Boston, Mass., and a telegram in the nature of a petition from Local Union No. 142, Inside Telephone Men's Union, of Boston, Mass., praying that an investigation be made of the Federal administration of telephone and telegraph lines, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented the petition of Henry H. Edes, W. M. Davis, and 136 other citizens of Massachusetts, members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, of Boston, praying for action by the President and Congress with a view toward establishing a league of nations for the maintenance of peace, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, it will be remembered that a few days ago we had before the Senate a bill reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency providing that the law be changed so that a national bank may loan more than 10 per cent upon its capital and surplus. I have received a great many telegrams on this subject, but I shall present only one, and I ask to have it printed in the RECORD. It is from the North

Dakota Bankers' Association. They favor the provision recommended by the board and the Comptroller of the Currency.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARGO, N. DAK., February 8, 1919.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

North Dakota national banks very much in favor of bill increasing loaning capacity to 20 per cent of capital. Will greatly aid in development of industries.

NORTH DAKOTA BANKERS ASSOCIATION.

Mr. GRONNA. I also present two telegrams, one from the chairman of the North Dakota Council of Defense, of Bismarck, N. Dak., and one from the chairman of the committee on agriculture of the General Assembly of Connecticut and the president of the Farmers' Association of Connecticut, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BISMARCK, N. DAK., February 4, 1919.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The woman's committee of the North Dakota Council of Defense finds the home demonstration agents invaluable in carrying out Government requests. Work just now well underway, and any decrease in fund available for this purpose will be fatal. Woman's committee urges you to do your utmost to defeat bill cutting appropriation.

Mrs. F. L. CONKLIN, Chairman.

HARTFORD, CONN., February 6, 1919.

Senator ASLE J. GRONNA,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The farmers association of the Connecticut General Assembly is shocked at the news that the United States Congress is taking away nearly all of our appropriation for extension work in agriculture in our State, and we are appealing to your judgment and for your assistance in preserving this most useful and efficient instrument that assists us in feeding our people. Please help us in this crisis.

CLIFFORD E. HOUGH,

President Farmers Association.

Connecticut General Assembly of 1919.

WATSON WOODRUFF,

Chairman Committee on Agriculture, Connecticut General Assembly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. My colleague and myself have received a telegram from the Michigan State Legislature in the form of a resolution which was adopted January 2 in behalf of woman's suffrage, practically ratifying the provision to be submitted to the people. This being, as I understand it, the first State to adopt such a resolution, I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

LANSING, MICH., February 8, 1919.

Senator CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,

Washington, D. C.:

Following is copy of resolution adopted by the Michigan Senate and House of Representatives in joint convention on January 2, 1919:

Whereas an amendment to the Federal Constitution providing that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged in the United States or any State on account of sex" has passed the House of Representatives and is now pending in the Senate; and

Whereas during the war, in recognition of the value of woman's war service the Parliaments of Great Britain and Canada enfranchised the women of those countries, and those of France and Italy have virtually promised the same act of political justice; and Whereas immediately after signing of armistice autocratic Germany and Hungary gave women the ballot; and

Whereas in our own country women vote on same terms as men in 15 States and have some voting rights in 20 others laboriously acquired during a struggle of 40 years; and

Whereas the electors of Michigan defeated woman suffrage five years ago by 96,000 votes, two months ago it carried by nearly 35,000 votes, an indication of the great change in sentiment throughout the State; and

Whereas the leaders of all political parties, major and minor, have demanded the passage of this amendment, and the national committee of the major political parties have earnestly indorsed it: Therefore be it Resolved, That we the members of the Michigan State Legislature in joint session assembled, in recognition of the justice of women's demands and of their contribution to society in war and in peace, do hereby call upon the Senate of the United States to pass the woman suffrage amendment and give the States opportunity to ratify the same.

DENNIS E. ALWARD,

CHARLES E. PIERCE,

Secretaries of Joint Convention.

Mr. PITTMAN. I present a telegram from the governor of Nevada, transmitting resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Nevada urging the passage of the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for woman suffrage, and requesting the Senators from that State to vote for it. I ask that the telegram may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read, as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

CARSON, NEV., February 8, 1919.

Hon. KEY PITTMAN.

Hon. CHARLES B. HENDERSON.

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Assembly joint and concurrent resolution No. 2 was approved by me February 4, 1919, and is as follows:

"Whereas there is now pending before the Senate of the United States a resolution to submit to the several States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting the right of suffrage to women; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has urged the passage of such resolution not only as an act of justice to the women of America, but as a means to encourage the acceptance of democratic ideals throughout the civilized world; and

"Whereas the world war laid its burdens and sacrifices with even hand upon men and women alike and demanded and received from both the fullest measure of patriotism and devotion, in order that the great purposes for which the war was successfully fought might be permanently secured for the benefit of mankind; and

"Whereas in the period of readjustment and reconstruction upon which we have entered there will arise the most difficult and far-reaching moral, social, economic, industrial, and political problems that must of necessity affect the lives of all our people for generations to come and in the solution of which men and women must equally be concerned: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Senate of the United States be hereby requested to immediately pass such resolution to submit to the States for their approval the Susan B. Anthony amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senators from Nevada be requested to present this resolution to the United States Senate and to energetically and actively support the resolution submitting such amendment."

EMMET D. BOYLE, Governor.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask leave to have published in the RECORD, following the telegram just read, the list of the names of the women representing the National American Woman Suffrage Association of the State, which has indorsed the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly joint and concurrent resolution.

Whereas there is now pending before the Senate of the United States a resolution to submit to the several States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting the right of suffrage to women; and

Whereas the President of the United States has urged the passage of such resolution, not only as an act of justice to the women of America but as a means of encouraging the acceptance of democratic ideals throughout the civilized world; and

Whereas the world war laid its burdens and sacrifices with even hand upon men and women alike and demanded and received from both the fullest measure of patriotism and devotion in order that the great purposes for which the war was successfully fought might be permanently secured for the benefit of mankind; and

Whereas in the period of readjustment and reconstruction upon which we have entered there will arise the most difficult and far-reaching moral, social, economic, industrial, and political problems that must of necessity affect the lives of all our people for generations to come and in the solution of which men and women must equally be concerned: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Senate of the United States be hereby requested to immediately pass such resolution to submit to the States for their approval the Susan B. Anthony amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators from Nevada be requested to present this resolution to the United States Senate and to energetically and actively support the resolution submitting such amendment.

Helen T. Belford, Sadie D. Hurst, Mrs. I. B. Church, Emma G. Vanderheith, Mrs. W. H. Hood, Mrs. Mark Walser, Mrs. F. G. Patrick, Fannie V. McKenzie, Mrs. C. H. Burke, Mrs. R. D. Eichelberger, Mrs. W. H. Bray, Mrs. Christina W. Clark, Mrs. Tegwen M. Daniel, Mrs. O. H. Mack, Mary Franzman, Mary A. Boyd, Nevada Suffrage Ratification Committee of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, indorsed by the Woman's Citizens' Club, of Reno, Nev.

Mr. KELLOGG. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Minnesota Legislature, session of 1919.]

Resolution by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring), memorializing Congress to provide means for purchasing and moving of the wheat still remaining in the hands of the farmers.

Whereas fully one-third of the wheat crop of the Northwest tributary to the terminal markets of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth still remains in the hands of the farmers, who are anxious to dispose of their grain, but are advised by grain buyers that they are unable to purchase any more wheat for the reason that an embargo has been imposed against all shipments of grain; and

Whereas in some parts of Minnesota and North Dakota the granaries are not in condition to carry grain for any considerable period, and if the embargo against the shipments of grain is not lifted at once and the wheat disposed of there will be a great loss sustained by the farmers of this section, who, responding to the call of the Federal Government to produce this wheat, did so under personal sacrifice and under difficult conditions, owing to the fact that many of their young men were taken into the Army: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring), That we request the Government of the United States to cause some provision to be made for moving of such

wheat as speedily as possible, and we ask and urge the Representatives of the State of Minnesota in Congress to do all in their power to have some means provided for the purchase and movement of the wheat crop still in the hands of our farmers: Be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house is hereby instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of Agriculture and to each of the United States Senators and Congressmen from Minnesota.

Adopted February 4, 1919.

Attest:

W. I. NOLAN,
Speaker of the House.

OSCAR ARNESON,
Chief Clerk.

Mr. KELLOGG. I also present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Minnesota Legislature, House of Representatives, session of 1919.]
A concurrent resolution to the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States.

Whereas the successful prosecution of the recent world war would have been impossible without the staunch and loyal cooperation of the Nation's workers; and

Whereas many of these workers have, while engaged in industry, sustained injuries as serious and as enduring as those suffered by soldiers on the field of battle and are as greatly in need of rehabilitation in order that they may be restored to capacity for useful pursuits; and

Whereas there is now pending in Congress a bill known as the Smith-Bankhead bill (S. 4922; H. R. 12880), which would make available for industrial and other crippled the same advantages of retraining that have been extended to soldiers wounded in the line of duty, granting aid from the Federal Treasury for the reeducation and placement of the disabled and giving the invaluable assistance of the Federal Government in standardizing and developing such work: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring), That we earnestly and urgently petition your honorable body to give early and favorable consideration to the aforesaid Smith-Bankhead bill, both as an act of justice and as a fitting recognition of the splendid service of American labor during the recent world crisis.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Minnesota.

W. I. NOLAN,
Speaker of the House.

OSCAR ARNESON,
Chief Clerk.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Ottumwa, Iowa, praying that better service be rendered by the express companies, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Town Club of Marshalltown, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the return to the United States of any person who was engaged in opposition to the United States and its allies in the war, and for the deportation of all enemy aliens, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch United Textile Workers of America, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the establishment of an eight-hour workday for textile workers, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Monday Evening Club of Washington, D. C., praying for the passage of the so-called Johnson-Nolan minimum-wage bill, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented memorials of the Ida County Farm Bureau; of Rev. Howard P. Young, of Boone; of S. F. Buck, of Diagonal; of F. J. Ritchie, of Cherokee; of H. L. Vander Hammer, of Ireton; and of Raymond Murphy, of Denmark, all in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the reenactment of the so-called daylight saving bill, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Arthur, Iowa, praying for the early return of our soldiers from abroad, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Creston, Waterloo, Dubuque, and Des Moines, all in the State of Iowa, praying for Government ownership of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. NELSON. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of Minnesota, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Minnesota Legislature, session of 1919.]

Resolution by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, the Senate concurring, memorializing Congress to provide means for purchasing and moving of the wheat still remaining in the hands of the farmers.

Whereas fully one-third of the wheat crop of the Northwest, tributary to the terminal markets of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth, still remains in the hands of the farmers, who are anxious to dispose of

their grain but are advised by grain buyers that they are unable to purchase any more wheat for the reason that an embargo has been imposed against all shipments of grain; and

Whereas in some parts of Minnesota and North Dakota the granaries are not in condition to carry grain for any considerable period, and if the embargo against the shipments of grain is not lifted at once and the wheat disposed of there will be a great loss sustained by the farmers of this section, who, responding to the call of the Federal Government to produce this wheat, did so under personal sacrifice and under difficult conditions, owing to the fact that many of their young men were taken into the Army: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring). That we request the Government of the United States to cause some provision to be made for moving of such wheat as speedily as possible, and we ask and urge the Representatives of the State of Minnesota in Congress to do all in their power to have some means provided for the purchase and movement of the wheat crop still in the hands of our farmers; be it further

Resolved. That the chief clerk of the house is hereby instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of Agriculture and to each of the United States Senators and Congressmen from Minnesota. Adopted February 4, 1919.

W. I. NOLAN,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

OSCAR ARNESON, Chief Clerk.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, which I ask to have printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House resolution 11.

Whereas the largest metal-mining industry in the State of Kansas is the zinc-mining industry; and

Whereas the said industry has been greatly crippled by reason of the immense importations of zinc ore from foreign countries, which said importations amounted in four years ending July 30, 1918, to the huge total of 824,000 tons; and

Whereas the War Industries Board has recently removed the embargo of April, 1918, which prohibited the use of ship bottoms for the importation of zinc ores; and

Whereas there are now 350,000 tons of zinc ore concentrated in Australia ready for shipment to the United States, together with a potential importation of 150,000 tons of zinc ore per year from Mexico and Canada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas. That immediate action is necessary to save the zinc-mining industry of the State from destruction by reason of these huge importations, and therefore the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to take immediate action to save said industry by attaching a rider to the present revenue bill providing for a tariff of 2 cents per pound upon the metallic content of all zinc ore imported into the United States; and be it further

Resolved. That the Senators and Congressmen from the State of Kansas be requested to immediately confer with the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House, with a view to having such a provision incorporated in the revenue bill.

Adopted February 5, 1919.

W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Speaker of the House.
CLARENCE W. MILLER,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a telegram in the nature of a petition from the president of the Kansas Council of Women, which I ask to have printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., February 10, 1919.

Senator CHARLES CURTIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Kansas Council of Women, representative 80,000 enfranchised, prays Senate vote simple justice to American womanhood; trusting justification to grateful centuries. 'Tis the Kansas way; make it national.

EFFIE GRAHAM,
President Kansas Council of Women.

Mr. COLT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Providence, Willimantic, West Kingston, Auburn, and Bristol, all in the State of Rhode Island, praying for the early withdrawal of our troops from Russia, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of Crawford County Branch of the Kansas Division of the Farmers' Education and Cooperative Union of America, praying for the enactment of legislation to guarantee \$2.20 per bushel for the 1919 wheat crop, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Dodge County, Kans., praying for the proposed extension of Federal control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WARREN. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, favoring the adoption of the woman suffrage amendment, which I ask to have printed in the Record.

The resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Wyoming, ss:

I, W. E. Chaplin, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of enrolled act No. 1, House of Representatives, Fifteenth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, being original house joint resolution No. 1, has been carefully compared with the original filed in this office on the 4th day of February, A. D. 1919, and is a full, true, and correct copy of the same and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 7th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]
W. E. CHAPLIN,
Secretary of State.
By H. M. SYMONS, Deputy.

[Enrolled joint resolution No. 1, House of Representatives, Fifteenth Legislature of the State of Wyoming.]

A joint resolution relating to woman's suffrage.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring):

Whereas there is now pending in the Senate of the United States a resolution providing for the submission of a constitutional amendment, which will grant full rights of suffrage to the women of the Nation; and

Whereas the right to vote was granted to the women of Wyoming in the year 1869, and 50 years' experience in this State has proven the real merit and worth of woman's suffrage; and

Whereas we heartily indorse said resolution and sincerely believe that suffrage for all women of this Nation would be not only a great moral and social benefit but also a practical success: Therefore be it

Resolved. That the Senate of the United States is hereby earnestly requested to pass said resolution at an early date; and be it further

Resolved. That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded at once by the Hon. W. Chaplin, secretary of state, to Senator JONES, of New Mexico, and also to the United States Senators from Wyoming.

E. J. SULLIVAN,
Speaker of the House.
T. G. POWERS,
President of the Senate.

Approved:

ROBERT D. CAREY,
Governor.

FEBRUARY 3, 1919—6 p. m.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia presented a petition of sundry citizens of Portsmouth and Norfolk, in the State of Virginia, praying for Government ownership of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HALE. I present a petition of certain members of the Seventy-ninth Legislature of the State of Maine, praying for the passage of the woman suffrage amendment, which I ask to have printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Hon. FREDERICK HALE,
United States Senator from Maine, Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned members of the Seventy-ninth Legislature of Maine, believing that in response to the demand for a more complete and consistent democracy in this country inspired by the ideals of the world war, there has been a change in the attitude of the people of Maine toward the question of the enfranchisement of women since the referendum submitted in 1917, and that the proposed Federal amendment to the Constitution granting the franchise to women would, if submitted, be ratified by the legislature of this State, do hereby, without assuming the right in any way in our capacity as legislators to dictate what your course of action should be, respectfully request you to give your vote and support to secure the passage of that measure.

WILLIAM L. WALKER AND OTHERS.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of Twin City Council, No. 160, United Commercial Travelers of America, of Auburn, Me., praying for the return to private ownership of the railroads of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Philomothian Club of Fort Fairfield, Me., and a petition of the Woman's Literary Club of Caribou, Me., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MOSES. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, requesting Congress to use its influence with the Government to pay our private soldiers and noncommissioned officers promptly, which I ask to have printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution passed by the New Hampshire Legislature February 6, 1919.

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring). That whereas we have heard with regret of the delay in the payment of wages to our soldiers;

Resolved. That we request our National Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their influence with the Government—

First, to pay our private soldiers and noncommissioned officers promptly; and,

Secondly, to give every private soldier, noncommissioned officer, and sailor, at the time of his honorable discharge, the sum of \$200.

Mr. McKELLAR. I present two telegrams from citizens of my State relative to the national suffrage amendment, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., February 9, 1919.
HON. KENNETH D. McKELLAR,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

As representative of 20,000 organized-labor men of Tennessee, we call upon you to do all in your power to secure the passage of the national suffrage amendment Monday. We expect you to use every legitimate means of influence with Democratic Senators to win the one vote needed. Defeat of this measure, justice to American women, would bring everlasting discredit upon your party.

TENNESSEE FEDERATION OF LABOR.
JNO. O'CONNOR, President.
PAUL AYMON, Vice President.
W. C. BIRTHWRIGHT,
Secretary and Treasurer.
HAS HANSLEY,
Legislative Chairman.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., February 9, 1919.
HON. KENNETH D. McKELLAR,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Tennessee women are looking to you not merely to vote for the suffrage amendment, but to work hard and fast to secure the one vote still needed. We will never forgive the Democratic Party if it allows our measure to be defeated on Monday.

Mabel F. Chumley, Mrs. W. T. Bland, Mrs. Margaret Severance, Mrs. Franklin Harris, Mrs. Y. L. Abernathy, Mrs. J. D. Alsop, Mrs. Claudia Griscom, Mrs. B. B. Crandall, Mrs. Florence W. Hughes, Mrs. Paul Moross, Ella F. Dyer, Mrs. D. H. Barker, Mrs. Mary V. Grayson, Mrs. J. W. Westbrook, Mrs. Benj. Bush, Mrs. H. A. Burnett, Marjorie B. Burton, Frances Pursell, Mrs. Edward Mulery, Mrs. Dorothy M. Donahue, Mary Donahue, Mrs. Wm. Hoge, Katherine E. Shirley, Mrs. W. H. Robinson, Selma J. Robinson.

Mr. SPENCER. I present a telegram from the speaker of the house of representatives of the Legislature of Missouri, which I ask to have read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., February 9, 1919.
Senator SELDON SPENCER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress on Federal woman-suffrage amendment passed by Missouri Senate and House. Official text follows.

S. F. O'FALLON, Speaker.

Mr. BORAH. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial 3, by Pettibone (by request), which was filed in this office on the 4th day of February, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 5th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1919 and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.]

ROBERT O. JONES,
Secretary of State.

[Legislature of the State of Idaho, fifteenth session. In the Senate. Senate joint memorial 3. By Pettibone (by request).]

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho respectfully represent that—

Whereas the construction of a suitable wagon road over which auto trucks can be operated up the South Fork of the Clearwater River, in Idaho County, State of Idaho, beginning either at the town of Stites or the city of Grangeville, both being railroad terminal points, thence up said river to the gold-mining districts of Elk City, Dixie, and Buffalo Hump is a great public and national necessity; and

Whereas since the announcement by the honorable Secretary of the Treasury: "That next in importance to war munitions and foodstuffs was a greater production of gold," the question of a greater production of gold has ever since and now is being seriously considered by the National Government, and that said question is now being considered by the national committee, with a view of determining what is the best method of bringing about the desired results, and that in all probability there soon will be large appropriation made for the construction of highways into the gold districts, where needed; and

Whereas said proposed highway would intersect the gold-mining districts as follows: Clearwater, Ten Mile, Elk City, Dixie, Oro Grande, and Buffalo Hump, all known to be gold-producing sections, and with proper transportation would yield a large output of the precious metal, now so much desired by the Government; and

Whereas the construction of such a road was contemplated something like two years ago, and data compiled and submitted to the Government, showing the necessity for such a road from a cheaper postal-operating expense as well as the operating of the National Forest Department, and that the same was approved by the Government on a basis of 50-50; and

Whereas under present conditions the constitutional limitations of the State of Idaho prohibit the raising of a sufficient fund to meet the

Government on said 50-50 basis, and that locally the county and State are bonded to their limit for other road purposes, including the North and South Highway, which is now under construction; and Whereas such a highway would not only be a great benefit in opening up the several gold districts mentioned but would ultimately be extended and be another artery or highway extending across the country, connecting with said North and South Highway, and would be a great benefit to the Government in lessening the operating expenses from both Parcels Post and Forest Reserve Departments, and would also open up a vast grazing country and timberlands, and would be a great accommodation to something like 250 homesteaders along said route or adjacent thereto: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, do recommend that \$500,000 be appropriated, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to construct said highway or wagon road, as aforesaid.

The secretary of state is hereby instructed to forward copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and copies of the same to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This joint memorial passed the senate on the 24th day of January, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

This joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 30th day of January, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within joint memorial 3 originated in the senate during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

PAUL DAVIS,
Secretary of the Senate.

(Indorsed: Received and filed, Feb. 4, 1919. Robert O. Jones, secretary of state.)

INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS IN PORTO RICO.

Mr. SAULSBURY, from the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, to which was referred Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 211) authorizing the appointment and sending of a commission to Porto Rico to study its industrial and economic conditions, and for other purposes, reported with amendments and submitted a report (No. 701) thereon.

FEDERAL COMMISSION ON RECONSTRUCTION.

Mr. OVERMAN. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back without recommendation the bill (S. 4968) to provide for the creation and establishment of a Federal commission on reconstruction, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 700) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES ON RECONSTRUCTION.

Mr. OVERMAN. I also report from the Committee on the Judiciary, without recommendation, Senate concurrent resolution 25, submitted by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] on November 21, 1918, to provide for the appointment of certain joint congressional committees on reconstruction, and I submit a report (No. 699) thereon.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on next Saturday morning I shall endeavor to bring before the Senate for its consideration the resolution just reported from the Committee on the Judiciary by its chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. I give this notice for the convenience of Members of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND NATIONAL QUARANTINE.

Mr. THOMPSON. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate resolution 443, submitted by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] on the 8th instant, and I call the attention of that Senator to the resolution.

Mr. RANDELL. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized, during the Sixty-fifth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 5563) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hankinson, in the State of North Dakota, captured German cannon, cannon balls, or shells, and gun carriages, condemned United States cannon, cannon balls, or shells, and gun carriages; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 5564) granting a pension to Nancy Herrald (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 5565) granting a pension to Mary E. Gray (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 5566) for the relief of the claimants of certain unsurveyed lands in Mississippi County, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 218) changing the name of the Panama Canal to the "Roosevelt Canal"; to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

By Mr. GORE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 220) empowering and requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to ascertain the cost of producing cereals, cotton, live stock, and other staple farm and food products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 221) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to adjust and settle certain claims and making appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

EXTENSION OF INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS.

Mr. NEW. I introduce a joint resolution and ask for its immediate consideration:

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 219) to extend the time for filing income-tax returns to April 15, 1919, was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NEW. It is very evident, as seen, I can not obtain unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution; but I shall call it up to-morrow for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has to go to the Committee on Finance. It is a joint resolution.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WEEKS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for cooperative agricultural extension work, etc., from \$1,500,000 to \$4,573,680, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OVERMAN submitted an amendment relative to the repeal of appropriation and authorization, housing for war needs, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the third deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMERICAN TROOPS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and I desire that it may be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 444) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate, United States soldiers should be withdrawn from Russia as soon as practicable.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I understand that under subdivision 5 of Rule IV, the resolution lies over for one day, but I give notice that I shall call it up at the earliest possible moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over and be printed.

FREIGHT RATES ON FERTILIZER MATERIAL.

Mr. GORE. I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 445) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate the following information in regard to the proposed consolidated freight classification No. 1.

(1) The freight rate as proposed under said classification on cotton-meal seed cake and hulls and other fertilizer materials, including nitrate of soda, acid phosphate, potash, etc., in less than carload lots, as compared with existing freight rates on such articles and materials;

(2) The proposed rates under such classification on said articles and materials in less than carload lots, as compared with the proposed rates in less than carload lots on commercial fertilizers; and

(3) The freight rates under the proposed classification on such articles and materials in less than carload lots, as compared with the rates proposed on such articles as automobiles and furniture, in like lots.

AGENTS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN MICHIGAN.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 446), as follows:

Whereas it is known that a large number, to wit, more than 25 men have been in the State of Michigan for a great portion of the time since August, 1918, representing themselves to be agents of the United States Department of Justice, and many are there now; and Whereas said men are accused of indulging in unlawful and unwarranted practices: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether he has sent any special agents into Michigan; and if he has, how many have been sent, together with their names; how many are there now; the purpose for which they were sent and are now retained there; and what instructions, if any, were given these men by him.

Mr. ASHURST. Let the resolution go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not wish the resolution to go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. If I can not get unanimous consent to have it considered at this time, I desire that it go over.

Mr. ASHURST. I desire to have the resolution go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections before it is considered by the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is merely a request for information, with which I think the committee has nothing to do.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Michigan yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The Senator who is chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections does not seem to be in the Chamber.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not think the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] will have any objection to the resolution. I am perfectly willing, if any Senator objects, that it shall go over a day for consideration.

Mr. KING. Under the circumstances, I think it should go over.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution goes over until to-morrow.

MEMORIAL ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE IN HONOR OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT (S. DOC. NO. 384).

Mr. SMOOT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 447), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the manuscript entitled "Address of Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, in honor of Theodore Roosevelt before the Congress of the United States, Sunday, February 9, 1919," be printed as a Senate document, and that 10,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

OIL AND GAS LANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, there is on the desk a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) which authorizes the signature of JAMES D. PHELAN, a Senator from the State of California, to be attached to the conference report upon the oil and gas land leasing bill. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may go over without prejudice until to-morrow morning.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear the request of the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I simply requested that the resolution to which I referred may go over until to-morrow morning without prejudice.

Mr. SMOOT. The resolution has not as yet been presented to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been read, and went over under the rules on objection.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It was presented to the Senate, was objected to, and was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well, then.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over until to-morrow without prejudice.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Tuesday, the 11th of February, 1919, or as soon thereafter as possible, I shall move to suspend that provision of paragraph 3, of Senate rule 16, prohibiting any amendment proposing general legislation to any general appropriation bill, for the purpose of offering the following amendment to the river and harbor bill (H. R. 13462), now pending, by adding a new section to the bill, as follows:

Sec. —. To resume and prosecute work on projects and units thereof under the reclamation act stopped during the war, and to begin and prosecute existing projects and units thereof which are practically ready for prosecution, to be immediately available and to be expended under the terms and conditions of the reclamation act, except that in the matter of employment a preference shall be given to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, \$50,000,000.

DELEGATE TO MARMORA CONFERENCE.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I present an article from the New York Sun of issue of February 8, 1919, relating to George D. Herron, named as one of the two delegates to the conference at Princes Island, Sea of Marmora, to meet the Bolshevik representatives, if any representatives shall be sent. I do not ask that the article may be read; but, in view of the remarks I submitted here on the conditions attending women under the Bolshevik government and certain decrees of the Soviet council on their treatment under that government and the maintenance and care of the offspring as wards in common of the state, I ask that this article be incorporated in the RECORD, without reading, but that it be printed in full. I think it very material.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE LOVER TO BE UNITED STATES ENVOY—GEORGE HERRON NAMED AS ONE OF TWO DELEGATES TO MARMORA CONFERENCE—WILLIAM A. WHITE IS OTHER—EXPELLED EDUCATOR AND AFFINITY TRIED TO FOUND MARRIAGELESS COLONY.

PARIS, February 7.

William Allen White, of Emporia, Kans., and Prof. George Davis Herron have been appointed the American delegates to the Marmora conference with the Russian factions.

George D. Herron, socialist, writer, lecturer, expelled pastor, and free-love advocate, first loomed large on the American horizon when he persuaded his wife to divorce him and immediately thereafter announced that he and Miss Carrie Rand were living together.

This was the climax of one of the most sensational stories that had startled the country in years, for Herron and his affinity contemplated a sequel in a "free-love colony" in Metuchen, N. J., where all with the same beliefs—and money—could come for rest, love, and joy.

METUCHEN CITIZENRY OBJECTED.

The couple had bought several hundred acres of the lands around Metuchen and intended splitting it up into farms for the soul mates, but certain hardware of the solid citizens persuaded them to abandon their love-promotion scheme. In later years, though, the couple returned to the Jersey town and were cordially received.

Stories of the day were to the effect that Miss Rand had bought and paid for her affinity with \$50,000, which she settled upon Mrs. Herron to get a divorce from her husband. The wife admitted having been paid.

The mother of Miss Rand, Mrs. E. D. Rand, widow of a lumberman who had grown wealthy, saw possibilities of a new Messiah in Herron, whom she endowed with a chair in Iowa College. She is said to have paid \$60,000 for it. He was made professor of applied Christianity, and proceeded to apply his version of it until the college expelled him years later.

He was expelled by the Congregational Church of Iowa because of his free-love views blooming in his sermons, much to the consternation of the farmers who hadn't even heard of Utah. Their wives objected, too.

EXPELLED AFTER DESERTING FAMILY.

Herron held on at the college, however, for some time. Finally, when he deserted his wife and two children to go and live in the same house with the Rands, this was more than the good professors could stand, so they expelled him, too.

The divorce followed, and the Rands and Herron came on to New York, where they plighted their announcement late in May, 1901, in 50 West Forty-fifth Street. The ceremony consisted in repeating the phrase, "We intend to live together as man and wife." Then some one sang "The Land of Heart's Desire," and with it the idea of the love colony was formed.

Finding a timetable handy, the name "Metuchen" being novel and odd and likely to be remembered when all else was forgot by the strolling lovers of love colony, the Herron-Rand combination settled upon it for their Eden. But the citizens would not have it so. Like another famous garden, it was "to let" shortly after the couple arrived and let the neighbors nibble of the apple that they had bitten voraciously. The dream was over.

In the same year Herron was hissed and rebuked by an audience at Harvard when he told its members, all Harvard students, that the university was a parasitic institution. He added that Theodore Roosevelt, who was then Vice President, was a "bully and an enemy of the people." The latter remark also applied to Rudyard Kipling, he said. Harvard never invited him any more to address it.

Herron incurred the anger of the ministry by saying: "It is not Jesus that we ought to follow, but the highest truths of our own souls." After this observation many men, among them Mayor Gaynor, refused to attend dinners at which Herron was present.

AFFINITY DIES IN ITALY.

Under the constant criticism Herron's health failed. He and his affinity went to Florence, Italy, where they lived for several years, returned to this country, and again went to Florence, where Miss Rand died January 15, 1914.

While Herron was in Florence trying to recuperate Mrs. Rand founded the Rand School of Social Science, and hoped that he would return to conduct it. The future of the school was made secure with a fund of \$200,000, and it is now running in East Fifteenth Street. Herron was generally considered by his college associates as being "daft or worse," according to a symposium of opinions gathered at the time of his free love affair announcement.

Recently Herron was involved in an alleged "peace scheme" in Switzerland, when Chancellor von Hertling is supposed to have sent Prof. Quiddie to Herron to effect peace between Germany and the United States. Herron was styled in German newspapers a personal friend of President Wilson. His peace formula didn't please the Germans, because, they said, it advocated "killing the Germans first and then make peace with them." Throughout Europe, according to dispatches from The Hague, the peace scheme was a farcical play among unauthorized parties.

William Allen White is proprietor and editor of the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette and is well known as a newspaper man and writer throughout the United States. He is a former member of the Progressive Party national committee and was chairman of the Progressive publicity committee.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on January 25 approved and signed the following acts:

S. 3299. An act authorizing the President to reappoint Maj. Chalmers G. Hall, retired, to the active list of the Army; and

S. 4924. An act to amend section 336 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the annual report on the statistics of commerce and navigation of the United States with foreign countries.

DISPOSITION OF SEIZED LIQUORS.

Mr. KING. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 10851) to provide a method for disposing of intoxicating liquors now or hereafter in the possession of United States court officials, and I submit a report thereon.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the Attorney General is very anxious to have this bill passed. I do not believe there will be any objection to it, because it only authorizes the disposal of liquor that has been seized. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. PENROSE. Let the bill be read, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill and the amendment, which was to add—

Or to order the same sold for such purposes, the proceeds to be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PITTMAN. I object.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an objection. The bill goes to the calendar. Is there any further morning business? [A pause.] The morning business is closed.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House joint resolution 200.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 200) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

Mr. POLLOCK obtained the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to move an amendment, in order that it may be pending, to insert the word "white" just before the word "citizens."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the state of the rules the joint resolution is not subject to amendment save by unanimous consent, it having passed to the third reading.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is utterly useless to ask unanimous consent, so I shall not take up the time of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution has passed to the third reading. The sole question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, when the representatives of the people are called upon to decide a momentous issue upon which their constituents are greatly divided, and to grant or refuse a right to which it is claimed the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to their course. Let this then be my excuse and apology for consuming a little of the time of this greatest of all deliberative bodies in presenting to the Senate of the United States, and through it to the people of the whole Nation, my reasons for the vote which I shall cast on the pending resolution to submit to the various States the justice and the advisability of so amending the Constitution of the United States as to extend to the women of America the right or privilege of suffrage on the same condition as that right or privilege is extended to men.

The Members of this body have been referred to as Senators of certain States, but no student of our Constitution could for a moment claim that any Senator is a Senator of a particular

State. On the contrary, he is a Senator from a certain State of the United States of America. As a Senator coming from South Carolina, one of the original thirteen colonies that voluntarily entered into the Union and helped frame the Constitution of our common country and became one of the thirteen original States; coming from the State of John C. Calhoun, the leading exponent of State rights; coming from the State that first exercised the right to secede from the Union, I want to say that we of South Carolina are happy and rejoiced that we were not permitted to remain out of the Union, and we are to-day as true and as loyal as any part of this great country of ours. We honor its flag, we glory in its history, we rejoice in its wonderful power and resources, and we are proud to be a part of the best country upon which God's sun shines. We have long since ceased to regret that in the Providence of God we were not permitted to set up a separate government of our own. We had the right to secede under the Constitution. My father, my kindred, and my countrymen fought for that right, but the Constitution of the United States was amended at Appomattox when Lee tendered his sword to Grant, and when, with the sword, it was written into the Constitution the immortal words of Lincoln on the field of Gettysburg:

It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that the Nation shall, under God, have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

From that day forward the greatest of all State rights was destroyed, the States in their separate sovereignty ceased to exist; and now we have a nation the wonder and the admiration of the world instead of forty-eight separate and independent petty States; and in this day of world upheaval when the foundations of civilization and of human liberty have been shaken, when the last great struggle between barbarism and civilization, between slavery and freedom, has been fought out on a scale heretofore undreamed of, thank God that America, the young giant of the West, my country and your country, is one and inseparable, so that America could in part at least fulfill her mission on earth to destroy autocracy and set up democracy, to banish human slavery and set up human liberty, to take away special privilege and establish equal rights to all, to break the power of the strong oppressor and give the opportunity of self-government to the weak, and I must believe that in God's appointed time all these things will come to pass, and that it is for us to hasten its coming.

In approaching a discussion of this resolution it seems to me that two considerations must of necessity enter—the one of principle and the other of expediency. Principles are eternal, expedients are temporary. A principle is right to-day, to-morrow, and forever. An expedient may appeal to us to-day and be obnoxious to us to-morrow.

We should enter upon the consideration of this resolution from the standpoint of principle, because it is now sought to incorporate the pending resolution in the permanent statement of principles that constitute the organic law of our country. I hold, with Thomas Jefferson, that all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it." I hold, sir, that man is not more than the equal of woman. I hold, sir, that woman has the same right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as man. I hold, sir, that this Government was instituted to secure these rights as much for woman as for man. I hold, sir, that our present form of Government has been and is destructive of these ends in that it has denied to woman the liberty to which she is entitled, the right to have a voice in her government; the right to participate in the selection of her officials; the right to counsel in the enactment of the laws under which she and her children shall live, upon which her life, her liberty, and her happiness depend. I hold, sir, with the Revolutionary fathers that taxation without representation is tyranny, and that to-day our country, our Government, controlled, directed, and administered by the manhood of America is tyrannically treating the best women of the world by exacting taxes from them without their express consent.

What could give to any citizen of a country a right to vote except a stake in that country? Who could have a greater stake in a country than a wife, a mother, a mistress of a home? I say to you that the family rather than the individual is the proper unit of government. I say to you that a combined family has a greater stake or interest in our country than any individual can have. I say to you that on that account a family should have a greater voice in the affairs of the Nation

than any individual—that a man with his wife and daughter should have greater power than any single man, and yet, under our system of government, of voting, the bachelor's vote counts as much as the family's, and this can only be remedied by giving to woman her just right—the right to vote and thus participate in her Government. I say further that there are thousands—yes, hundreds of thousands—of women in this land who have been forced to go out into the world to make a livelihood for themselves and those who are dear to them; they are living by their own labor, and they have as much right to vote as any man. There are more than 400,000 women public-school teachers in America—about 80 per cent of all teachers in the common schools—and they are molding the opinions of the oncoming generation who will administer our Government, and yet they themselves are denied the privilege of participating in their Government.

Whence came the right of man to vote? Was it given under the Constitution of the United States? Search that wonderfully compact instrument from beginning to end, and nowhere will you find that the right to vote and hold office was ever granted to man to the exclusion of woman.

Under the XIV Amendment to the Constitution it is provided:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

Article II, section 5, of the Constitution, prescribed the qualifications for President, and nowhere does sex enter into it, but merely citizenship, age, and residence. The same is true as to Representatives in Congress as laid down in Article I, section 2, and the same is true as to Senators as laid down in Article I, section 3. The word "person" is used, and under the XIV Amendment all persons, whether male or female, are included in the term citizen. Therefore, since the adoption of the XIV Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, denying to the States the right to abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States, and denying the States the right to deprive any person of liberty or the equal protection of the law, I respectfully submit that as a matter of constitutional law we have no right to say to woman "Thou shalt not vote."

Who gave man the right to vote? It will be answered that the States conferred that privilege. And who controlled the States? The manhood of the States, and the men assumed a power, a privilege that every impulse of human nature, every dictate of conscience, every high and noble and worthy sentiment should have required that they should have shared with woman. They won the right to exercise full citizenship only with the aid, the comfort, the sympathy, and the patient endurance of hardship of the women—they won this by force of arms with the assistance of woman—and then when they had won the victory of American independence and freedom and liberty they withheld from woman, without whom they could not have won, her fair share of that freedom and liberty. She is a citizen without its privileges, a taxpayer without a voice, a partner without her profit, and all this because she can not bear arms and fight wars for her own independence and freedom and liberty, just as man could not do without her comfort and assistance.

For more than 140 years in America we have had freedom and liberty for half our people, and we have had patient and uncomplaining slavery for the other half. For nearly a century, and a half we have had democracy for one-half of our people and tyranny for the other, and I say, sir, to-day that this Nation can not and will not endure forever one half free and the other half serf. The hosts of democracy are marching on, they are toppling over kings and thrones and setting up governments of the people; they are destroying special privileges and setting up equal rights; they are annihilating brute force and they are establishing justice; they are doing these things in foreign lands, and they will soon accomplish them here so that our country will not only be known as the land of the free and the home of the brave, but it will also be known as the land of truth, of justice, and of righteousness the world over.

This is no new proposition before the American people. For 40 years and more the women of America have been carrying on the unequal struggle, but they have been slowly gaining ground, so slowly, in fact, that perhaps men might have become discouraged; so gradually that if they had been engaged in a less honest cause they themselves might have abandoned it; but with the devotion and constancy of womankind, in the face of defeat after defeat, having nothing but the justice of their cause to hearten them, they have made the fight, they have kept the faith, they have endured hardship and heart burns even to the point where they brought censure and ridicule on them-

selves in order that they might keep the flame burning, in order that the conscience of man might be touched to hear their plea and do them justice. And now a brighter day is dawning. God grant that it may be my good fortune, in the brief time that I shall be a Member of this body, to aid in bringing about the adoption of this resolution whereby the political shackles shall be broken from the hands of the women of America, and whereby they shall be permitted to step out in the full bright light of American citizenship.

No sound reason has ever been advanced why woman should not have this privilege accorded to her, nor can any sound reason be advanced. She is a human being just as is man, she is subject to the laws of the land just as is man, she is required to contribute to the maintenance of the Government just as is man, she is interested in good government just as is man, she responds to the call of her country just as does man, she bears and rears the whole citizenship of the country, she loves her country and sacrifices for it even more than does man. That she should have this privilege is right, therefore it can not be wrong. To exercise that privilege is honorable, therefore it can not be dishonorable; and the manhood of America has already indorsed woman's right to vote from one end of America to the other. A number of the States of the Union have accorded the right; the Republican national convention has indorsed the principle; the Democratic national convention has indorsed the principle; a two-thirds majority in the National House of Representatives has voted its approval; a large majority—nearly two-thirds—of the Senate of the United States has voted its approval; the people of America, through their representatives in the two great political conventions, have spoken for the principle and have declared the claim of the women is just; the people, through their representatives in the Congress of the United States, have tried to accord this privilege to them; the President of the United States, speaking as only Woodrow Wilson can for the democracies of the world, has appealed to this body to do this simple act of justice to the mothers, the wives, and the daughters of this land just as Britain has done.

They had earned this consideration at the hands of the manhood of America before this awful war, and who will say that the women of this land have not doubly earned all that they ask, all that they desire, all that could be bestowed upon them by their magnificent spirit of patriotism since we have been engaged in this war for world freedom? They have, without a murmur, given up their husbands, their sons, their sweethearts, and placed them on the altar of their country; they have sacrificed their own home life that the homes of all might be safe; they have gone into the hospitals and ministered, as only a woman can, to the sick, the wounded, and the dying; they have laid aside their personal comforts and pleasures and have joined the great Red Cross army that the men over yonder might suffer less; they have taken up man's work in order that men might be free to fight for liberty and civilization; they are working in the offices, the factories, the mercantile establishments, and on the farms that industry may not die and the world suffer therefrom; aye, they have done all things that befit a woman, a good citizen, and if any doubt should have existed heretofore as to woman's right to vote it does seem to me that she has by her conduct in America during the past two years dispelled that doubt.

When nurses were needed she has volunteered, when laborers were needed she has responded, she has aided in the great campaigns for floating the Government's bond issues, she has subscribed liberally from her own funds, and by her enthusiasm and charm has caused the men to do their duty. When men have become discouraged she has heartened them, when men have lagged behind she has encouraged them.

America has done and is doing with woman's help what she never would have done without it.

The argument that this is a matter for action by the States, and that to pass this resolution is a violation of State rights, is not a reason but an excuse on the part of many for opposing this resolution, and a very poor excuse at that.

When a respectable portion of the American people ask that the question of amending the Constitution of the United States be submitted to the States for their approval or disapproval, it is a denial of State rights to refuse to let the States through their legislatures act. There is but one right that each separate State has under the Constitution which can not be taken away from it without its consent, and that is to have equal representation in the Senate, but the Constitution may be amended in all other particulars when three-fourths of the States so decree. And surely no one will say that the right of any one State should be greater than the right expressly conferred upon three-fourths of the States acting jointly through

their several legislatures to amend the Constitution in other respects. The right of three-fourths of the States to amend the Constitution is one of the highest rights of all State rights, and when this resolution shall have passed this body by the necessary two-thirds vote, as I feel sure that it will, then the right—the States' right—to adopt or reject the proposed amendment will be conferred upon the States rather than withheld from them. I do not hesitate to say, sir, that to refuse to pass this resolution under the circumstances is to refuse to give to three-fourths of the States a right which they have under the Constitution, and that under the pretext that we would be giving to three-fourths of the States the power to take away from a single State a power or right which it does not possess under the Constitution.

No one State has the right to say what the qualifications for voting shall be when three-fourths of the States express themselves otherwise, and no State has the right to say to three-fourths of the States that they shall not amend the Constitution other than as to equal representation in this body. John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, possibly the greatest exponent of the doctrine of State rights in America, the patron political saint of South Carolinians and one of the greatest statesmen that our country has ever produced, in his masterly reply to Webster in 1833, speaking of the rights of the States under the Constitution, said:

In this compact they have stipulated, among other things, that it may be amended by three-fourths of the States—that is, they have conceded to each other by compact the right to add new powers or to subtract old by the consent of that proportion of the States without requiring, as otherwise would have been the case, the consent of all—a modification no more inconsistent with their sovereignty than any other contained in the document.

And so, Mr. President, occupying for the time being the same seat so well and ably filled by Mr. Calhoun, I find that in disagreeing with those who take the position that to amend the Constitution in this way is to despoil the doctrine of State rights I am but following the lead of the greatest of State rights statesmen.

The original Constitution is silent as to the powers delegated to the United States or prohibited by it to the States—the question of the right to vote was not delegated, it is true, to the United States, nor was it prohibited by the Constitution to the States, and it was provided in the tenth amendment as follows:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved in the States, respectively, or to the people." This amendment was adopted by the votes of 11 of the then 14 States, and South Carolina was the fourth State, January 19, 1790, to adopt this amendment. Had it not been for the passage of this amendment, it might be now debatable whether the power to prescribe the qualifications for voting was in the United States or in the several States, because, as you will note in Article I, section 2, it is provided that the qualification for suffrage for Members of Congress shall be the same as that provided in the different States for the most numerous branch of the legislature of that State, and the seventeenth amendment is practically a repetition of that provision in the Constitution in so far as the qualification for suffrage for the United States Senate is concerned. Had it not been for the passage of this amendment, it might be now debatable whether the power to prescribe the qualifications for voting was in the United States or in the several States, because the power was neither delegated to the United States nor expressly retained by the several States; but since the adoption of the tenth amendment any doubt that may have existed has been removed—the power is in the several States—and the Federal Government can only take away or limit this right by amending the Constitution of the United States; and by the adoption of the fifteenth amendment the power to limit the right of the several States to abridge the right of suffrage has been expressly recognized and upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The right on the part of three-fourths of the States to amend is therefore stronger than the right of any one State to prevent the amendment, and while I do not believe, as a matter of policy, that the fifteenth amendment should have ever been placed in our Constitution, and while I would go as far as any man to repeal that amendment, we must all admit that the power to adopt the amendment was not an abridgment of State rights.

It is argued that we should not submit this proposed amendment to the various States on account of the race question in the South. Do Senators realize that when two-thirds of this body, representing two-thirds of the States in this Union, shall have passed this resolution, as pass it we will, that this resolution must then be adopted by the legislatures of not a majority, not two-thirds, but three-fourths of all the States of the Union?

Do they realize that the legislatures of 13 States out of the 48 States can prevent its adoption, that it will require favorable action on the part of the legislatures of 36 States before this resolution can become a part of the organic law of the land? Will any Senator say that there is more wisdom, more fairness, and more justice in any 33 Members of this body than there is in the representatives of 36 of the States of this Union?

Are we living up to our professions of democracy, of faith in our people, when we refuse to permit them to decide these questions themselves? Are we sincere, and can we make the world believe that we are sincere, when we say that we entered this great war from purely altruistic motives, in order that the peoples of the earth may govern themselves, not only in selecting their officials, enacting their statutory laws, construing and executing their own laws, but making and changing their constitutions upon which all these things depend, and still deny to our own people the right to settle this question that involves the liberty and freedom of one-half of our citizenship? Sir, I say here to-day that I have confidence in the white people of America—blood is thicker than water. Efforts may be made by certain politicians to force upon us the rule of the ignorant, the vicious, and the inferior; some men who do not appreciate the burden of the white man in the South may undertake to turn over to the negro the control of our affairs in the South, but I have confidence in the white manhood of the North; I believe in the white womanhood of the North; I have faith in the white civilization of the whole United States.

We may have to fight the same political battles that we fought in reconstruction days in the South, but it will be white people against negro people. The black man could not control the white man, and the negro man and the negro woman combined can not any the more control the white man and the white woman combined, but to quote the words of a distinguished citizen and statesman of the South, "Never, sir, will a single State of this Union, North or South, be delivered again to the control of an ignorant and inferior race. We wrested our government from negro supremacy when the Federal drum beat rolled closer to the ballot box and Federal bayonets hedged it deeper about than will ever again be permitted in this free Government. But, sir, though the cannon of this Republic thundered in every voting district in the South, we still should find, in the mercy of God, the means and the courage to prevent its reestablishment." And here to-day, speaking in behalf of the womanhood of America, speaking as a representative of a section that has been much misunderstood, and naturally so, I swear anew my allegiance to my own people, my own blood, my own race, and while you of the North, the East, and the West, who are not set about with our own peculiar problem, can not pass this resolution without assistance from the South, I pledge you that in my capacity as a Senator of the United States I know no section, I see only my whole country, and I covenant with you, and you covenant with me, that you will do under this amendment as you have done under the fifteenth amendment—you will not undertake to place in control over us a race of people that you would never allow to govern you. The white men have outvoted the negro men, and that under trying conditions, and, God helping us, from this day forward the white men and the white women will outvote the negro men and the negro women.

Mr. President, in the short time that I have been a Member of this body the three greatest social questions that ever have engaged the attention of a people have been before the American people. It has been my good fortune to witness the ratification of the last amendment to the Constitution whereby liquor was driven out of America. It has been my privilege, sir, speaking my own sentiments, and as God is my judge, believing I speak the sentiments of the people of America, to speak for the peace of America and for the peace of the world.

So to-day another opportunity is presented to me which I gladly grasp. That is, not only to raise my voice in behalf of human liberty and freedom for the women of America, but it shall be my privilege to cast a vote for that which I know to be right and which therefore can not be wrong.

Mr. President, when this joint resolution was last before the Senate of the United States it needed but two votes to pass it. Since that time it has been my fortune to come here. It is now my privilege, my pleasure, to present to the womanhood of America one-half of all the votes that were needed when the joint resolution was here before. I do not know what changes there may have been, but I do know that if all those who voted for the joint resolution when it was here before shall vote for it again to-day, when that vote is supplemented by my vote the

women of American can need but one vote to-day. So the responsibility is placed squarely up to every Senator in this body who may vote "nay." You can grant or you can deny justice to the women of America. Each man has the whole responsibility resting upon him. Dare you deny that right? You who hesitate, you who believe in it, you who want to follow your President, you who want to follow your legislatures, you who want to follow the American people, you who hear the call of justice, will you dare assume all the responsibility, because if the joint resolution fails to pass to-day each and every man who votes "nay" will thereby take upon his own shoulders the whole responsibility for the failure of the measure.

Sir, I come from the South. I come from a State that has a majority of negro population. Some men have said that they do not want to force anything on the South. I tell you, speaking for the new South, speaking for the real South, speaking for the American South, we want this privilege. We feel that the women are entitled to it, and we know that we can handle any race question that comes up in this enlightened age. We know there is no danger from it. You need not withhold your vote because you think that some of us down there do not want it.

Let me call this further to the attention of the Senate. The Republicans are committed to the principle. The Democrats are committed to the principle. The two great political conventions have put it in their platforms. It is just a question now of the method by which you will get it.

Let me tell you that no man will be nominated for the Presidency by either party who is not an advocate of woman suffrage. Let me tell you that neither convention of either party would dare fail to place in its platform when it meets in convention next year a plank calling for the passage of this joint resolution. Everybody will be for it when the next conventions meet. You will be bound to vote for it then whether you will or no.

Let me tell you, you may defeat it to-day, but you only postpone it. You may postpone it for a few months, it may be possibly for a year, but this Congress, as it is gradually dying, has the opportunity to make itself immortal. If you do not pass this joint resolution the incoming Congress will pass it. You can not prevent the passage of the joint resolution. You can not prevent giving women the right to vote. They are going to have it. It is just a question whether you will do it to-day or whether you will do it a little later.

I beg Senators, when only one vote is needed, not to turn deaf ears to 50,000,000 of people. It is too late now for any man belonging to either party to doubt the wisdom of women voting. We are all committed to it. It is coming; it is here. I believe, Mr. President, that the joint resolution is going to pass to-day, and this Senate will go down in history forever more on account of that than on account of any other one thing that it may have done during its time.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I shall vote for the joint resolution because I believe in it, and because I know that if it is adopted and the women of the entire country are given the vote they will use it intelligently. I did not rise in my place to discuss that subject particularly this morning, but just to occupy the time of the Senate for a few moments on a matter which deals with it relatively.

Mr. President, the other day the Secretary of War presented to the ranking officers of the Army in this country distinguished-service decorations. The newspapers heralded the fact, and properly so, for I think it can fairly be said that no group of men in this country rendered more valuable service in our war with Germany than did these very officers.

We have all read the published accounts of the fact that many of our officers and men abroad have been cited for bravery in action, but I have failed to observe where the women of America who enlisted in the Army and rendered patriotic service as nurses back of the very front lines have received any unusual consideration at the hands of our Government. This fact prompted me to address a communication to the Secretary of War the other day, of which the following is a copy:

JANUARY 29, 1919.

HON. NEWTON D. BAKER,
The Secretary of War, War Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY BAKER: I observe that the War Department is awarding to a number of officers and enlisted men, both in France and in this country, medals of honor for meritorious services performed during the war, all of which, in my judgment, were well earned; but it occurs to me that there are many women who served with the Army in France in our hospitals who are equally entitled to consideration for services rendered, and if medals of honor can be awarded to these women under the law, I trust that they will not be overlooked. If, however, you can not do this, I will be pleased if you will prepare and send to me a bill that will cover the situation. This country,

has reason to be proud of its women, particularly those who have made such great sacrifices to take care of the men who have been wounded in battle.

Yours, very truly,

This letter was published in many of the New York newspapers, and as a result I have received a number of responses, among them the following, which I am much pleased to bring to the attention of the Senate as an evidence of the sympathy existing between the boys who fought overseas and the girls who took care of them when they were sick and wounded:

Mr. President, I now desire to read the following letter:

UNITED STATES EMBARKATION HOSPITAL No. 3,
New York City, January 30, 1919.

Senator CALDER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: To-night I read with interest your letter to Secretary Baker regarding medals to be issued to women war workers. Nothing would please the overseas boys more than to see our overseas and home girls receive the service medals so well earned. I know the home girls have done wonderful work in supplying our overseas Army with all the comforts possible. Here in New York they are treating us royal, but, Senator, it brings tears to my eyes when I think of the hardship the girls endured on the other side—the long hours they worked, the conditions they worked under, and the miserable accommodations they had. God bless them, Senator; you have got to be there to fully appreciate what the girls have done for us. I for one will never pass up the big drum again, and I will always honor the Salvation Army. I have seen the Red Cross hospital raided by the Huns and several nurses who gave all—much more than I. I hope the people as a whole will honor all women war workers, as they most surely deserve it.

It is true we left many of our boys over there, but is it not true that we left some of our girls over there as well?

This is one subject Congress can and will agree upon, and I know our President will be more than pleased to award the medals.

How I wished that I commanded words to express my appreciation of all war workers.

Thanking you for your interest taken on behalf of our girls—you know, Senator, our overseas boys call all lady war workers our girls, and we love to think of them as such—and that the honor that is their due will soon be theirs, I am,

Yours, very truly,

Pvt. GUSTAVUS A. BETTS.

Hospital. 1084914.

I am afraid, Mr. President, that in the hurry and rush of war we have failed to pay the tribute due these wonderful women who were willing to make every sacrifice for their country. Thousands of our best women have been with our Army from the beginning of the war, at times under most difficult circumstances, and some have been under fire repeatedly. I have in mind one Miss McDonald, a nurse, who went over with a unit from the Presbyterian Hospital, of New York City. Miss McDonald was wounded at Ypres, losing an eye, and was treated for several months but returned to service again. I am informed that she received a British decoration, but, so far as I can learn, she has not yet been cited by her own Government. This should not continue a day longer. These splendid women ought not, under any circumstances, to be overlooked. They did more than they were asked to do, not only in France but here in this country as well.

No war was ever won by any nation without the united support of its women, and it is true, indeed, the American women have rendered every service in their power for their country. I call this matter to the attention of the members of the Military and Naval Committees especially, and hope, if legislation is required to properly honor these women, that such measures as may be necessary be immediately brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, when the joint resolution was pending before the Senate last fall I offered the following amendment to it:

On page 1, line 11, after the word "sex," insert the following: "but no male person who is not a citizen of the United States shall exercise the right of suffrage at an election for Senators and Representatives in Congress or for electors for President and Vice President of the United States, and no female person who is not such a citizen otherwise than by marriage, or who, having acquired citizenship by marriage, has not complied with such requirements and conditions as may be prescribed by the Congress, shall exercise such right."

At that time, in speaking upon the amendment, I said:

"I am in favor of a constitutional amendment properly drawn which will permit the worthy women of this country who are citizens, either by birth or through the regular and orderly processes of naturalization, to have the right of suffrage; but I want that amendment so drawn that it will protect the worthy women, who should vote, against the unworthy, who should not vote, and I want it so drawn that Congress can hereafter pass laws properly protecting this enlarged and increased electorate. I conceive it to be our duty under our oath as Senators to pass an amendment that will do this."

"Generally, married women are regarded as citizens of the country of which their husbands are citizens. This principle is recognized by the laws of the United States, section 1994 of the Revised Statutes providing that—

"Any woman who is now or may hereafter be married to a citizen of the United States and who might herself be lawfully naturalized shall be deemed a citizen."

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does not the Senator recognize the fact that this is a House joint resolution, and that if any amendment, no matter what it might be, should be offered to it and passed by the Senate it would send the resolution back to the other House for concurrence, and, therefore, it would be impossible to pass the measure during this session of Congress?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That may be a prophecy of the Senator from Colorado, but I am not aware that the ordinary processes of legislation should be stopped by reason of such a prophecy. I want to point out to the Senate, and to make it emphatic, that either we should amend this joint resolution or we should immediately address ourselves to amending our immigration laws before the proposed amendment to the Constitution is ratified in the event it shall pass the two Houses of Congress. I hope, therefore, the Senator from Colorado will allow me to continue, inasmuch as I wish to be placed on record in regard to this resolution—

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey decline to yield?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I trust the Senator will bear with me for just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield further to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield further to the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator from New Jersey may not have been in the Chamber when the Vice President announced that no amendment whatever would be in order to the joint resolution, because in the parliamentary status of the joint resolution it has been read a third time, which is the final action that can be taken before the passage.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I was in the Chamber when the Vice President announced that ruling; I am aware of it; but I know of no ruling which will deprive me of speaking on the joint resolution, which I am doing at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey will proceed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In my remarks on the occasion referred to I continued:

"It is of fundamental importance that in considering this provision of law the fact shall not be overlooked that Congress, in adopting it, was proceeding in pursuance of authority conferred upon the Congress by Article I, section 8, paragraph 4 of the Constitution—the authority 'to establish a uniform rule of naturalization.' Therefore, the marriage of a foreign woman to an American citizen is, in its effect upon the status of the woman, a process of naturalization, and it must be borne in mind that the woman who acquires citizenship in this manner is, by virtue of the language of section 1994 itself, as fully naturalized as though she had gone through the court processes of naturalization required in the cases of males and in the cases of unmarried females, and as completely a citizen of the United States as though she had been born here. The Constitution 'contemplates two sources of citizenship, and two only—birth and naturalization'—said the Supreme Court in the leading case on citizenship, entitled *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* (169 U. S., 649, 702).

"The procurement of United States citizenship by a foreign woman through marriage to a citizen is not, of course, surrounded with any of the safeguards that are, and have been for many years, placed around the procurement of citizenship through the regular court processes provided by law. Some of those safeguards are the following:

"A male alien desiring to become a citizen of the United States must make a declaration that he is not an anarchist, a polygamist, or a believer in the practice of polygamy, and that it is his intention in good faith to become a citizen of the United States and permanently to reside therein. Not less than two years and not more than seven years after he has made his declaration of intention he must again petition the court and take an oath that he is not 'a disbeliever in or opposed to organized government, or a member of or affiliated with any organization or body of persons teaching disbelief in organized government,' and so on. Then he is examined by the United States examiners, and if the court so directs he becomes a citizen, but under the Revised Statutes a foreign woman who has attained her citizenship by marriage to an American citizen is not held to conform to that process of law."

"Is it not essential that we should write in the Constitution a provision which will enable Congress to pass legislation that will restrict the menace arising from this condition? I do not think the amendment as drawn does this, and I believe that Congress should take the precaution to lay the foundation for protecting the country in this regard. After consultation with the legal advisers of the Immigration and Naturalization Bureau I am firmly of the opinion that if the amendment should be adopted as drawn it will not be possible thereafter for Congress to remedy the situation described by me by passing legislation. In other words, the constitutional amendment, unless it shall be changed in some such manner as that I suggest, will prevent the passing of any legislation to place any restriction with regard to the exercise of the franchise upon foreign women who have become citizens by marriage.

"This citizenship-by-marriage provision was enacted by the Federal Congress when women could not vote and at a time when Congress had no thought of giving them the vote, its object being to protect property and dower rights and to care for many legal and international questions. To accomplish these purposes Congress conferred the benefit of such citizenship upon such women. Now women are asking for the additional benefit of the right of suffrage—too long denied them—but a changed situation is created, which Congress should carefully consider before passing a constitutional amendment. The view has been expressed by some lawyers that Congress could afford protection to the elective franchise under this constitutional amendment by hereafter passing statutes naturalizing foreign women married to citizens and worthy of the privilege of voting. Possibly a statute could be passed that hereafter would protect the electorate and compel married women who have become citizens by marriage to be naturalized in a court proceeding before they vote, but I do not believe it."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record at this point the entire address I delivered on that occasion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Sept. 30, 1918.]

"Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, a few days ago I proposed an amendment to the pending joint resolution. While I realize that the Senate is fatigued, I shall be forced to be away to-morrow if I can arrange a proper pair, and I would like to speak briefly upon my amendment. I ask that the Secretary may read the amendment.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

"The SECRETARY. At the end of the joint resolution add the following:

"but no male person who is not a citizen of the United States shall exercise the right of suffrage at an election for Senators and Representatives in Congress or for electors for President and Vice President of the United States, and no female person who is not such a citizen otherwise than by marriage, or who, having acquired citizenship by marriage, has not complied with such requirements and conditions as may be prescribed by the Congress, shall exercise such right.

"Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, the avowed and the obvious object of the resolution now pending before the Senate is to place women who are citizens of the United States upon an equality with men who are such citizens in the matter of the exercise of the right to vote; to confer suffrage upon female citizens of this country throughout the length and breadth thereof. My object in proposing an amendment to that resolution is to make it possible, in what seems to me the best way open to us, for the resolution actually to accomplish that obvious purpose and to avoid what seems to me to be the very serious danger that, in the very act of conferring the right to vote upon women and of abolishing the inequalities in that regard which have heretofore existed, we shall perpetuate and increase evils already existing and create new ones that will prove a constant and increasing source of embarrassment to us in the future administration of governmental affairs.

"At the outset I desire to make it perfectly plain that I am not opposed to the adoption of the woman-suffrage amendment—on the contrary, I am distinctly in favor of its adoption—but my attention has been attracted to the situation which I shall now endeavor to explain to the best of my ability, and I have felt that this situation is so serious that I should be derelict in the performance of my duty as a Member of this body should I fail or neglect to call its dangers to the notice of each and every Member of the Senate.

"With this by way of preface, I shall proceed to state the purposes of and reasons for the additions to the proposed constitutional amendment which I have offered in the form of an amendment to the resolution. My first object is this: To place in the Constitution itself a provision which will safeguard the country against the exercise of the right of franchise in Fed-

eral matters by aliens residing or sojourning within our midst. And it has seemed to me that not only is this of such great importance as to justify efforts toward the accomplishment of the reform at any and all times, but the pendency before the Senate of the resolution under discussion affords an opportunity for its accomplishment in an appropriate and efficient manner that ought not by any means to be overlooked.

"Under the constitutions of seven States of this Union aliens now exercise the right of franchise in connection with every elective office candidates for which are ordinarily voted for in the other States, to wit, Indiana, Missouri, Kansas, Arkansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Texas. Recognizing the menace to the safety of government of such a policy as this, a number of States have recently amended their constitutions so as to allow only native-born persons and persons who are fully naturalized under the regular legal process to vote therein, to wit, Alabama, Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, and others that I can not recollect.

"To show the abuses which arise under such a policy, which is contrary to the very spirit of the Federal naturalization laws, attention might be directed to the fact that the following methods have recently been applied in a certain Western State where the declarations of intention made by aliens in the course of a year would hardly approximate two dozen and the declarations made within 30 days preceding and including election day—made under the influence of vote manufacturers—have approximated a thousand or more in several of the courts exercising naturalization jurisdiction in the State: The ambitious candidate has his henchmen line up all the foreigners in the district whom he can enlist. He makes his drive through the industrial plants, foregathers with the aliens in their club organizations, extols the virtues of his candidate—and this applies regardless of party—and by various inducements and blandishments prevails upon the foreigners to assemble at convenient places and in the day and night time the accommodating clerk of the court supplies the necessary blank forms and accepts the statutory fees coming from an appropriate source. Up to and including election day this business continues. All day long, in the presence of Government officials, the stream of aliens has been seen to enter the room where the clerk of the court is located and to leave that room with statements from the clerk showing that the aliens have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, and, in the light of the provision of the State constitution, showing also by implication that such aliens have become clothed by the mere act of declaring an intention to become citizens with such character, intelligence, and understanding of our institutions that they are entitled to exercise the franchise in the same way and with the same effect as a person born in our midst.

"Under the resolution pending before the Senate, unless the part of my amendment directed to this situation, or some similar amendment, should be adopted, the evils and abuses to which I am calling attention will not only be perpetuated but will, perhaps, be practically doubled; for if and when the amendment proposed in the resolution is ratified by the requisite number of States, each and every foreign woman now living in the seven States I have mentioned and each and every one who shall take up residence there later who has attained the statutory age will be able to declare her intention, if she is unmarried, and by that simple act will be clothed with the right to vote alongside of the man.

"With this situation existing, any unmarried woman coming from the most anarchistic section of Russia, from the fastnesses of Bolshevism, from the I. W. W. ranks, or from any other source inimical to our interests or even believing in the utter destruction of our Government—any unmarried woman, no matter what her character may be, might be induced in the States mentioned to declare her intention to become a citizen, whereupon she could proceed to stamp the impress of her views and of her character, through the exercise of her right to vote, upon the laws of this country. This is an illustration none too extreme; but even if it should be regarded as extreme, the answer is that we must think through to the very depths of the possibility of an evil if we are correctly to measure the extent of such evil.

"Is it desirable or wise to lay a foundation in a constitutional amendment for the perpetuation of such a situation as this, especially when it may be so easily guarded against? I think not, and because of that view I have inserted in my proposed amendment the provision—

"But no male person who is not a citizen of the United States shall exercise the right of suffrage at an election for Senators and Representatives in Congress or for electors for President and Vice President of the United States.

"And have, in addition, so worded the remainder of my proposed amendment, the direct purpose of which is to meet an-

other situation, to the description of which I am about to proceed, that the same result will be accomplished with regard to females.

"The second object which I have in view is this: To insure that, in conferring the right to vote upon women who are citizens, we do not create a legal situation in which foreign women might, through the operation of the almost universally recognized principle that a married woman's citizenship follows that of her husband, qualify to exercise the franchise in Federal elections, although wholly unfitted by character, education, residence within the country, and knowledge of and regard for its institutions, or otherwise, to have a voice in public affairs. My second object, in other words, is so to change the wording of the resolution before us that it shall be made actually to confer upon women rights equal to those enjoyed in this regard by men, and not greater than those enjoyed by men.

"Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

"The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New York?

"Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the Senator rises to ask me a question, I would be very glad to answer it after I conclude. I know the Senate wants to adjourn, and I hope the Senator will not interrupt me now.

"Mr. CALDER. Very well.

"Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As I have already remarked, the object of the pending resolution is to place women on the same footing as men so far as the right of franchise is concerned. I am in favor of a constitutional amendment properly drawn which will permit the worthy women of this country who are citizens, either by birth or through the regular and orderly processes of naturalization, to have the right of suffrage; but I want that amendment so drawn that it will protect the worthy women, who should vote, against the unworthy, who should not vote, and I want it so drawn that Congress can hereafter pass laws properly protecting this enlarged and increased electorate. I conceive it to be our duty, under our oath as Senators, to pass an amendment that will do this.

"I do not know who prepared the pending constitutional amendment, but I believe it has been drawn without proper consideration or study of the Constitution and conditions that exist under our naturalization statutes, the careless disregard of them, the abuses that have crept into the making of citizens, and the apparent indifference of some authorities to the grave menace to the institutions of popular government that thus arise.

"In giving to this subject that careful study which its gravity demands, my attention has been attracted to two circumstances in particular. The passage of a resolution of this kind is closely related to the precarious situation in regard to aliens which has been brought about by the war and our participation in it. Congress has been forced to pass drastic laws at the eleventh hour to protect this country against sedition, treason, and deep-seated disloyalty, arising from the fact that so many foreigners reside amongst us and that Germany has carried on a surreptitious propaganda here ever since the war and evidently, from latter-day developments, even for many years before the war. It is not necessary for me to recite the many outrages, bombings, dynamitings, murders, committed by the disloyal foreigners residing here. The consideration of this amendment conferring upon female citizens the right to vote necessarily brings up at this critical time the grave question of our immigration and naturalization laws and policies, especially in their relation to and effect upon women of alien birth already here or who may hereafter come.

"The other particular circumstance was not fully appreciated by me, in its relation to the constitutional amendment as drawn, until I conferred with officials of the Bureau of Immigration and learned its extent and seriousness. It arises from the abuses that exist in connection with the traffic in women for immoral purposes. While our immigration laws have been framed with the object of protecting society against this traffic, nevertheless many women become citizens of the United States through pro forma marriages contracted simply for the purpose of giving the poor, unfortunate women a status of citizenship under our laws and preventing them from being deported. The pimp, the procurer, these vice scavengers of humanity, products of the swill barrel of foreign lands, carry on their immoral, unspeakable practices almost within the shadow of Ellis Island, the women being brought in from Europe, from the Orient, and from the Latin countries, and, except in the cases of Chinese and Japanese, a pro forma marriage contract can be entered into and these women become citizens of the United States and can not be deported unless the Government can show—under the most recent amendment to section 19 of the immigration act—that the marriage was contracted after the woman became liable to deportation under the law; and heretofore the enforcement of the act has been seriously impeded through the fact that a foreign

woman, no matter what her character, can secure citizenship simply by going through with a marriage ceremony, the other party to which is an American citizen.

"The foregoing are the two respects in which, it seems to me, the importance of the second part of my proposed amendment is made especially apparent at this time. I desire now to proceed to a more detailed discussion of the matter in its legal as well as its practical aspects.

"Generally, married women are regarded as citizens of the country of which their husbands are citizens. This principle is recognized by the laws of the United States, section 1994 of the Revised Statutes providing that—

"Any woman who is now or may hereafter be married to a citizen of the United States and who might herself be lawfully naturalized shall be deemed a citizen.

"It is of fundamental importance that in considering this provision of law the fact shall not be overlooked that Congress, in adopting it, was proceeding in pursuance of authority conferred upon the Congress by Article I, section 8, paragraph 4, of the Constitution—the authority 'to establish a uniform rule of naturalization.' Therefore the marriage of a foreign woman to an American citizen is, in its effect upon the status of the woman, a process of naturalization, and it must be borne in mind that the woman who acquires citizenship in this manner is, by virtue of the language of section 1994 itself, as fully naturalized as though she had gone through the court processes of naturalization required in the cases of males and in the cases of unmarried females, and as completely a citizen of the United States as though she had been born here. The Constitution 'contemplates two sources of citizenship, and two only—birth and naturalization,' said the Supreme Court in the leading case on citizenship, entitled *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* (169 U. S., 649, 702).

"The procurement of United States citizenship by a foreign woman through marriage to a citizen is not, of course, surrounded with any of the safeguards that are, and have been for many years, placed round the procurement of citizenship through the regular court processes provided by law. Some of those safeguards are the following:

"A male alien desiring to become a citizen of the United States must make a declaration that he is not an anarchist, a polygamist, or a believer in the practice of polygamy, and that it is his intention in good faith to become a citizen of the United States and permanently to reside therein. Not less than two years and not more than seven years after he has made his declaration of intention he must again petition the court and take an oath that he is not "a disbeliever in or opposed to organized government, or a member of or affiliated with any organization or body of persons teaching disbelief in organized government," and so on. Then he is examined by the United States examiners; and if the court so directs, he becomes a citizen, but under the Revised Statutes a foreign woman who has attained her citizenship by marriage to an American citizen is not held to conform to that process of law.

"What is the object of the resolution? It is to give men and women the same rights under the Constitution, to place them upon an equality in regard to the elective franchise. Does it do that? Will it attain its object?

"Under the Federal statute already quoted an alien woman who marries a man who is a citizen of the United States by birth or naturalization becomes a citizen, and under this resolution, as drawn, she would be entitled to vote; but a male alien or a female alien not married must be naturalized in a regular court proceeding under our naturalization laws before he or she becomes a citizen qualified under this proposed resolution, as drawn, to vote. Is that equal rights?

"A male alien—a German, for instance—marries an American woman, but he does not thereby become a citizen, and under this constitutional amendment he could not vote by reason of that marriage relation. But a female alien—a German woman, for instance—marries an American citizen, perhaps a German who has been naturalized. She thereby, ipso facto, becomes a citizen, and under this constitutional amendment could vote. Is that equal rights? Certainly not. It is conferring upon married women rights not conferred upon unmarried women or upon any man—rights which ought not to be conferred upon either women or men in any such haphazard, unregulated fashion.

"Again, the foreign man or unmarried foreign woman must reside here continuously for at least five years before the boon of citizenship will be conferred; but the foreign woman may by marrying a citizen become invested with all the rights and privileges of citizenship immediately upon landing upon our shores, including, if the constitutional amendment as proposed should be adopted, the right to vote. The foreign man or unmarried woman seeking in good faith, through the regularly

ordained channels, to become a citizen of this country must be of 'good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same.' But in the case of the foreign woman who marries a citizen no such standards are enforced; the marriage, ipso facto, confers citizenship, even though she is of bad character and even though she knows nothing and cares less about the principles of the Constitution. She does not have to be of good character, because the Supreme Court long ago held, in the case entitled Kelley against Owen, Seventh Wallace, 496, that the qualifying phrase, 'and who might herself be lawfully naturalized,' found in section 1994 of the Revised Statutes, means no more than that she must be of the general class—races—for which naturalization is authorized. Under this situation will the rights conferred be equal? Obviously not. Upon this fact too great emphasis can not be placed: If this resolution passes in its present form, foreign women married to citizens will become voters without any of the safeguards of naturalization through court processes.

"Mr. President, how many foreign women are there in the United States?

"The census of 1910 recorded 13,500,000 persons of foreign birth in our population. During the years 1911 to 1914, 3,000,000 more were added, according to the estimate of the Immigration Bureau. This is net—makes allowance for those who returned to their native lands. From 1915 to 1918 it is estimated immigration has been about 300,000 a year, making in these years of the war 1,200,000 immigrants added to our population. The total number of foreign-born persons here would, therefore, seem to be about 18,000,000.

"Mr. President, there are in the United States to-day 5,821,757 women of foreign birth. They are mostly in the large industrial States. I shall not read the statistics relative to them now. Suffice it to say that New York State has 1,296,849; Massachusetts, 526,922; Pennsylvania, 586,085; but that number has been increased by reason of the fact that the figures that I have read are from the census of 1910, and since that time immigration has increased by over 3,000,000. Therefore it is safe to assume that there are nearly 7,000,000 women of foreign birth in this country. I ask to have the letter which I hold in my hand from the Department of Labor giving these statistics inserted in the RECORD.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

"The letter referred to is as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
"Washington, September 24, 1918.

"MY DEAR SENATOR: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 23d instant requesting certain data regarding alien women in the United States, and will reply to your inquiries serially.

"1. Table 15, page 259, volume 1, of the Census Report of 1910, gives the number of foreign-born white women in the United States as 5,821,757, divided as follows:

| | |
|----------------------|-------------|
| New England: | |
| Maine | 52, 165 |
| Vermont | 21, 939 |
| Massachusetts | 526, 922 |
| Rhode Island | 87, 442 |
| Connecticut | 151, 691 |
| Middle Atlantic: | |
| New York | 1, 296, 849 |
| New Jersey | 301, 652 |
| Pennsylvania | 586, 085 |
| East North Central: | |
| Ohio | 251, 104 |
| Indiana | 62, 139 |
| Illinois | 528, 965 |
| Michigan | 261, 867 |
| Wisconsin | 222, 130 |
| West North Central: | |
| Minnesota | 222, 529 |
| Iowa | 116, 055 |
| Missouri | 97, 040 |
| North Dakota | 63, 523 |
| South Dakota | 40, 932 |
| Nebraska | 74, 284 |
| Kansas | 54, 096 |
| South Atlantic: | |
| Delaware | 7, 496 |
| Maryland | 49, 857 |
| District of Columbia | 11, 434 |
| Virginia | 9, 900 |
| West Virginia | 15, 773 |
| North Carolina | 2, 197 |
| South Carolina | 2, 335 |
| Georgia | 5, 554 |
| Florida | 13, 137 |
| East South Central: | |
| Kentucky | 18, 442 |
| Tennessee | 7, 312 |
| Alabama | 7, 130 |
| Mississippi | 3, 431 |
| West South Central: | |
| Arkansas | 6, 302 |
| Louisiana | 22, 139 |
| Oklahoma | 14, 414 |
| Texas | 103, 162 |

| | |
|------------|----------|
| Mountain: | |
| Montana | 27, 084 |
| Idaho | 12, 345 |
| Wyoming | 7, 003 |
| Colorado | 48, 777 |
| New Mexico | 7, 822 |
| Arizona | 16, 238 |
| Utah | 27, 447 |
| Nevada | 4, 172 |
| Pacific: | |
| Washington | 80, 476 |
| Oregon | 33, 241 |
| California | 191, 833 |

"2 and 3. Section 1994 of the Revised Statutes provides as follows: 'Any woman who is now or may hereafter be married to a citizen of the United States and who might herself be lawfully naturalized shall be deemed a citizen.'

"Section 4 of the act approved March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. L., pt. 1, p. 1228), which is merely declaratory of section 1994, Revised Statutes, provides as follows:

"That any foreign woman who acquires American citizenship by marriage to an American shall be assumed to retain the same after the termination of the marital relation if she continues to reside in the United States, unless she makes formal renunciation thereof before a court having jurisdiction to naturalize aliens, or if she resides abroad she may retain her citizenship by registering as such before a United States consul within one year after the termination of such marital relation."

"4. The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution defines those who shall be deemed citizens by virtue of their birth. Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution gives Congress power 'to establish a uniform rule of naturalization.' * * * The various provisions of law under this authority will be found in the Revised Statutes.

"Yours, very truly,

"JOHN W. ABERCROMBIE,
"Acting Secretary.

"Hon. J. S. FRELINGHUYSEN,
"United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

"Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, it will be seen from the foregoing that we already have here a very large number of foreign-born women. Of course, many of these are illiterate, many have had no educational advantages. Another fact that should not be overlooked is this: The tendency to enter into marital relations is marked among these immigrant races. Of course, we know little or nothing about their loyalty and the real allegiance of these women and less about their character; many of them may be anarchists, nihilists, polygamists, yet these women may, simply through the performance of a marriage ceremony, become citizens of the United States.

"Is it not essential that we should write in the Constitution a provision which will enable Congress to pass legislation that will restrict the menace arising from this condition? I do not think the amendment as drawn does this, and I believe that Congress should take the precaution to lay the foundation for protecting the country in this regard. After consultation with the legal advisers of the Immigration and Naturalization Bureau I am firmly of the opinion that if the amendment should be adopted as drawn it will not be possible thereafter for Congress to remedy the situation described by me by passing legislation. In other words, the constitutional amendment, unless it shall be changed in some such manner as that I suggest, will prevent the passing of any legislation to place any restriction with regard to the exercise of the franchise upon foreign women who have become citizens by marriage.

"This citizenship-by-marriage provision was enacted by the Federal Congress when women could not vote and at a time when Congress had no thought of giving them the vote, its object being to protect property and dower rights and to care for many legal and international questions. To accomplish these purposes Congress conferred the benefit of such citizenship upon such women. Now women are asking for the additional benefit of the right of suffrage—too long denied them—but a changed situation is created, which Congress should carefully consider before passing a constitutional amendment. The view has been expressed by some lawyers that Congress could afford protection to the elective franchise under this constitutional amendment by hereafter passing statutes naturalizing foreign women married to citizens and worthy of the privilege of voting. Possibly a statute could be passed that hereafter would protect the electorate and compel married women who have become citizens by marriage to be naturalized in a court proceeding before they vote, but I do not believe it.

"To hold that it can be tantamount to holding that the Congress can by statute compel a woman who has already been naturalized by marriage and who has by that process of naturalization become as full a citizen as though born here, to go through another process of naturalization—the court process—before she will be allowed to vote, notwithstanding a provision in the Constitution prohibiting the United States or the several States from denying or abridging on account of sex the right of a citizen to vote. No law will or can be passed hereafter in that regard that will protect the electorate against the unworthy or unqualified women who are given this right under this con-

stitutional amendment unless you lay the foundation in the amendment itself by the use of words that will confer upon Congress the power to do so.

"Perhaps it might be thought that the second section of the article of the amendment proposed in the resolution, providing that the Congress shall have power by appropriate legislation to enforce the provisions of the article, would lay a sufficient foundation for subsequent legislation dealing with the subject I am discussing. But I think that, obviously, such is not the case. The purpose of the second section of this proposed article of amendment is exactly the same as the purpose of section 2 of Article XIII, section 5 of Article XIV, and section 2 of Article XV of the Constitution. Its purpose is to indicate which of the three branches into which our Government is divided is to be charged under the Constitution with the enforcement of the particular article; and it confers a power to enforce—that is, carry out—not a power to modify, regulate, abbreviate, or extend. If it conferred a power of the latter character it would, moreover, be absolutely inconsistent with the first section of the proposed article of amendment.

"I contend that under this amendment providing that the right to vote shall not be abridged or denied on account of sex, the right being conferred when this constitutional amendment is ratified by the States, such right having been created through marriage—which marriage relation is possible because of sex—the moment you attempt to compel these women to go through any additional requirements before they exercise the franchise you will be doing the very thing the amendment prohibits, because you will be abridging the right of a female citizen to vote. Any such statute, if passed, would be unconstitutional. Of course, I do not contend that Congress can not at any time, under the authority conferred upon it by the Constitution to pass uniform naturalization laws, either amend or repeal section 1994 of the Revised Statutes. The power of Congress in this regard is no doubt plenary. This fact might naturally lead some to ask the question, 'Why attempt to cover this point in a constitutional amendment? Why not leave it to Congress to repeal the statute lying at the foundation of the difficulty?' But to such a question there are two sufficient answers.

"In the first place, section 1994, although a statute and therefore open to repeal or revision, is simply declaratory of a principle of law that is almost universally recognized and runs infinitely into important legal questions of both a local and an international nature. It is not likely, therefore, that Congress will ever go so far in amending and extending the naturalization laws as to abandon this principle. And just so long as citizenship can be acquired by women through the performance of a marriage ceremony will there exist the inequalities and evils to which attention has been called.

"In the second place, by such a constitutional provision as that proposed by me, the past as well as the future can be cared for. There are, of course, now in the United States a great many women, formerly foreigners, who have acquired citizenship through marriage. It may be seriously doubted that Congress could legally divest these women of the citizenship already acquired in that manner. The Supreme Court has said, in the Wong Kim Ark decision, already mentioned, that 'the power of naturalization vested in Congress by the Constitution is a power to confer citizenship, not a power to take it away.' But wholly aside from this legal doubt, it would hardly be fair and just to pass a law changing the status of these women from that of citizenship to that of alienage—certainly it would not be just or fair in many of their cases. On the other hand, no unfairness or injustice—and nothing in any sense illegal—is involved in so qualifying the conference of a constitutional right to vote as to make it possible for Congress hereafter to enact legislation requiring those whose citizenship arises merely from marriage to meet, in every substantial respect, before they will be allowed to exercise the right of suffrage, the conditions that males and unmarried females are required to meet before citizenship is conferred upon them.

"Accordingly the purpose I have in mind in inserting in my proposed amendment the provision that 'no female person who is not such a citizen otherwise than by marriage, or who, having acquired citizenship by marriage, has not complied with such requirements and conditions as may be prescribed by Congress, shall exercise such right' is to pave the way for the passage through Congress, in the event that the constitutional amendment should be adopted, of a law which would compel foreign women who acquire citizenship in the instantaneous and unregulated manner of going through a marriage ceremony to meet conditions and requirements similar to those now governing the conference of citizenship through court processes before they would be permitted to stand alongside men and women born here and men and women born abroad and natural-

ized here in the regular safeguarded manner and cast votes having the same effect in determining the course of government as the votes cast by the native-born and regularly naturalized citizens.

"I repeat, Mr. President, I am in favor of adopting a constitutional amendment which will bring about equality between men and women citizens in the matter of the vote; but I am also in favor of so wording such amendment that we will not perpetuate and increase already existing evils and create new inequalities that could not hereafter be rectified otherwise than by the slow and uncertain method of adopting still another constitutional amendment.

"I ask to append to my remarks, without reading, a statement showing citizenship qualifications for voting in woman-suffrage States.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

"The statement referred to is as follows:

"CITIZENSHIP QUALIFICATIONS FOR VOTING IN WOMAN-SUFFRAGE STATES.

"FULL SUFFRAGE.

"Arizona: Citizens only. (Const., VII-2.)
"California: Citizens only. Naturalized citizens must have been admitted to citizenship 90 days prior to the election. (Const., II-1.)

"Colorado: Citizens only. (Const., VII-1.) 'The same qualifications as to * * * citizenship * * * required by law to entitle male persons to vote shall be required to entitle female persons to vote.' (Courtright's Stat., 1911, sec. 2147.)

"Idaho: Citizens only. (Const., VI-2.)
"Kansas: Citizens and persons who have declared their intention to become citizens. (Const., V-1.) An amendment has been submitted to be voted on at the 1918 election limiting the right to vote to citizens of the United States. (Laws, 1917, c. 353.)

"Montana: Citizens only. (Const., IX-2.)
"Nevada: Citizens only. (Const., II-1.)

"New York: Citizens only. Must have been a citizen for 90 days. A citizen by marriage must have been an inhabitant of the United States for 5 years. (Const. amend., Laws, 1917, p. 2784.)

"Oregon (a senate joint memorial [Laws, 1917, p. 975] has been submitted to Congress requesting 'that equal qualifications be required of and equal privileges granted to each individual voter, irrespective of sex or the marriage relation in the States adopting woman suffrage') : Citizens only. (Const., II-2.)

"Utah: Citizens only. (Const., IV-5.)
"Washington: Citizens only. (Const., VI-1.)
"Wyoming: Citizens only. (Const., VI-5.)

"LIMITED SUFFRAGE.

"Illinois: Citizens only. (Const., VII-1; Laws, 1913, p. 333.)
"Michigan: Citizens only. (Const., III-1; Laws, 1917, No. 191.)
"Nebraska: Citizens and persons who have declared their intention to become citizens at least 30 days prior to election. (Const., VII-1; Laws, 1917, c. 30.)

"North Dakota: Citizens only. (Const., V-121; Laws, 1917, c. 254.)
"Rhode Island: Citizens only. (Const. amend., VII; Laws, 1917, c. 1507.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I know that there has been a ruling by the Vice President that no amendment can be offered to the joint resolution, but I had heretofore prepared an amendment, after the word "sex," on line 11, to add the following:

Provided, That no married woman shall be entitled to vote who would not be so entitled if she were a single woman.

Unless we can pass an amendment to our immigration laws to enable us to correct the evil to which I have referred, this proposed constitutional amendment will enfranchise thousands—yes, millions—of alien women who have never taken the oath of allegiance which the male alien is compelled to take, and who have never been compelled to undergo the searching investigation by United States officials, who examine every male applicant for citizenship. We will, therefore, if the proposed constitutional amendment is adopted unamended, enfranchise, through the provision of the Revised Statutes to which I have referred, millions of women without throwing this protection around the electorate. It is a mooted question whether an amendment can be made to the immigration laws, and therefore I feel that here and now is the place for us to write into the fundamental law of the land a prohibition against a condition that no patriotic American citizen wants to see.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment to which I have referred.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I object to unanimous consent.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico desire to be heard before the Chair rules?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] having read the proposed amendment, I presume it is not necessary to have it read again at the desk.

This amendment was presented to the Senate last September, and on that occasion I stated at some length the reasons why I felt compelled to oppose any amendment to the joint resolution. Did I not feel the same way now I should be inclined to waive the parliamentary point of order and permit the Senate to con-

sider the amendment, but it is quite obvious that the vote on the joint resolution itself would be greatly jeopardized if we were to amend it in any particular.

As has been stated by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], if an amendment were made to the pending joint resolution, it would require it to be again passed upon by the House. The time of this session of Congress is very short, and we feel that the joint resolution itself would be jeopardized by attaching any amendment to it.

As stated on the former occasion, the proposed constitutional amendment in its present form is the same as that which has been presented to the Congress for many years in the past. In a sense it has become sanctified by age, and I know that it would lead to the opposition of the great masses of the women of this country who have been so faithfully and so persistently advocating the passage of this proposed constitutional amendment in its present form.

If it were not for these considerations, Mr. President, I should not raise the point of order; but, under the circumstances, I feel compelled to do so. Therefore I raise the point of order that the amendment can not be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the joint resolution having been ordered to a third reading and having been read the third time, the amendment is not in order. The only question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, the question of woman suffrage has been discussed before this honorable body from every angle. Every Senator has his convictions and doubtless has well fixed in his mind just how he intends to vote when the roll is called; but, Mr. President, having only recently become a Member of the Senate, I desire to avail myself of the opportunity presented to briefly set forth my position on this great question.

I favor giving women the right to vote. As a member of the Louisiana Legislature I voted to submit the question to the people of Louisiana in the form of an amendment to the constitution of the State of Louisiana.

Following the legislative session of 1918 the senatorial campaign was waged for the seat made vacant by the death of Senator Broussard. The question of woman suffrage was not a vital issue in that campaign; but, as a candidate, I announced in public print and from the stump my intention to vote for the amendment to the constitution of Louisiana giving the women of my State the right to vote. I worked for its adoption and voted for it on November 5 last; but, Mr. President, during the campaign I told my people everywhere that should I be elected to the Senate I would vote against the Susan B. Anthony amendment. I consider that statement as binding.

At an extra session of the General Assembly of the State of Louisiana held in August, 1918, a joint resolution was adopted memorializing the Congress of the United States to reject the pending amendment to the Federal Constitution, which joint resolution reads as follows:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the people of Louisiana (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to reject the so-called Susan B. Anthony amendment to the Federal Constitution requiring each State to grant suffrage to the female sex without choice or limitation, and authorizing Federal power to enforce the amendment, the said Congress of the United States to declare by this action that the democracy of each separate American State is safe against the force and power of a combination of other American States; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon our sister States of the Union to likewise declare for State integrity and the safety of American democracy and vigorously oppose Federal interference or control with State franchise; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each House of Congress in the United States.

Mr. President, this, briefly, represents my point of view, and I heartily concur in the principles here set forth.

It is impossible for us who have the racial question to deal with to close our eyes and treat with indifference a problem which has been a boil upon the body politic for more than a generation, and which, happily for the welfare of both races, has been resting quiet for 15 or 20 years by the enactment of just laws in every State of the South.

Under these laws the South is prosperous. Crime has been reduced, and justice is meted alike to both races.

The passage of this amendment would again open an old sore, revive questions pregnant with dangerous consequences to the South, and would in time extend the power of Federal control to male suffrage and cause a most serious situation.

I have no patience with that little band of women, the militant suffragists, who seek notoriety and bring reproach upon the cause which so many noble women have espoused.

There is no denying the fact, Mr. President, that woman is entitled to the same authority in all questions governmental as

man. She has risen even higher than ever before in the estimation of mankind through the wonderful sacrifices and patriotism which she has shown in this war, from which we have just victoriously emerged. She should have the same right and expression by the ballot that men to-day exercise, but let that right be given promptly by each sovereign State of our Union.

The eminent jurist from Louisiana, my distinguished predecessor, Senator Guion, stated on the floor of the Senate:

My objection to the amendment now pending in the Senate is that under our form of government the right to give or withhold the privilege of suffrage rests with the States and is not given to the General Government.

Suffrage is a matter of local or domestic concern, to be dealt with by each State, acting in its sovereign capacity in the exercise of the power reserved to the States under the Federal Constitution, and as may best subserve and accord with existing local conditions and without interference by the Federal Government.

Holding these views, Mr. President, and having pledged myself to my people, I will now fulfill that obligation and will record my vote against the pending amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Henderson | Moses | Smith, Ga. |
| Baird | Hitchcock | Myers | Smith, Mich. |
| Bankhead | Hollis | Nelson | Smith, S. C. |
| Beckham | Johnson, Cal. | New | Smoot |
| Borah | Johnson, S. D. | Norris | Spencer |
| Brandegee | Jones, N. Mex. | Nugent | Sterling |
| Calder | Jones, Wash. | Overman | Sutherland |
| Colt | Kellogg | Page | Swanson |
| Culberson | Kendrick | Penrose | Thomas |
| Cummins | Kenyon | Pittman | Thompson |
| Curtis | King | Poinexter | Townsend |
| Dillingham | Kirby | Pollock | Trammell |
| Fernald | La Follette | Pomerene | Underwood |
| Fletcher | Lenroot | Ransdell | Vardaman |
| France | Lewis | Robinson | Wadsworth |
| Frelinghuysen | Lodge | Saulsbury | Walsh |
| Gay | McCumber | Shafroth | Warren |
| Gerry | McKellar | Sheppard | Watson |
| Gronna | McLean | Sherman | Weeks |
| Harding | McNary | Simmons | Williams |
| Hardwick | Martin, Va. | Smith, Ariz. | Wolcott |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll discloses the presence of 84 Senators. There is a quorum present. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. SHAFROTH, Mr. SHEPPARD, and Mr. HOLLIS called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLIS (when Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's name was called). On this question the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN] are paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. If the Senator from Kentucky were present, he would vote "yea"; if the Senator from Oregon were present, he would vote "yea"; and if the Senator from Missouri were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I am released from my obligation on this question, and therefore I vote "yea."

Mr. HOLLIS (when Mr. GOFF's name was called). On this question the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] are paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS]. If the Senator from West Virginia were present, he would vote "yea"; if the Senator from Oklahoma were present, he would vote "yea"; and if the Senator from Tennessee were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. HOLLIS (when his name was called). On this question the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and I are paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. If at liberty to vote, the Senator from Utah and I would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]; but I understand that he is in favor of the passage of this joint resolution and otherwise paired, and therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KING (when his name was called). The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] and I have a pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. Owing to the absence of the Senator from Pennsylvania I withhold my vote.

Mr. HOLLIS (when Mr. PHELAN's name was called). On this question the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] are paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. If at liberty to vote, the

Senator from California would vote "yea," the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

Mr. SPENCER (when Mr. REED's name was called). I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is detained from the floor by sickness.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Maryland was called). The senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is confined to his home by illness and unable to be present.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], but in view of the announcement made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS], I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. My colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], is detained on important public business.

The roll call resulted—yeas 55, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—55.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Johnson, Cal. | Myers | Smith, Ariz. |
| Calder | Johnson, S. Dak. | Nelson | Smith, Mich. |
| Coit | Jones, N. Mex. | New | Smoot |
| Culberson | Jones, Wash. | Norris | Spencer |
| Cummins | Kellogg | Nugent | Sterling |
| Curtis | Kendrick | Page | Sutherland |
| Fernald | Kenyon | Pittman | Thomas |
| France | Kirby | Poinexter | Thompson |
| Frelinghuysen | La Follette | Pollock | Townsend |
| Gerry | Lenroot | Ransdell | Vardaman |
| Gore | Lewis | Robinson | Walsh |
| Gronna | McCumber | Shafroth | Warren |
| Harding | McKellar | Sheppard | Watson |
| Henderson | McNary | Sherman | |

NAYS—29.

| | | | |
|------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|
| Baird | Hale | Penrose | Underwood |
| Bankhead | Hardwick | Pomerene | Wadsworth |
| Beckham | Hitchcock | Saulsbury | Weeks |
| Borah | Lodge | Simmons | Williams |
| Brandeggee | McLean | Smith, Ga. | Wolcott |
| Dillingham | Martin, Va. | Smith, S. C. | |
| Fletcher | Moses | Swanson | |
| Gay | Overman | Trammell | |

NOT VOTING—12.

| | | | |
|-------------|--------|-------------|------------|
| Chamberlain | Hollis | Martin, Ky. | Reed |
| Fall | King | Owen | Shields |
| Goff | Knox | Phelan | Smith, Md. |

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas are 55, the nays 29. The joint resolution, not having received the votes of two-thirds of the Senators voting, is rejected.

The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 15140.

THE CENSUS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I desire to avail myself of this opportunity to make a brief announcement.

On the 15th day of January the Senate adopted an amendment to the census bill, upon which amendment I submitted some preliminary remarks, not having had an opportunity to fully discuss the amendment. The amendment was adopted in the Senate and rejected by the conference committee. I desire to give notice that when the conference report is presented I shall discuss it at some length. However, as I am compelled to be absent some of the time from the floor of the Senate in committee work I shall appreciate it very much if the chairman in charge of the conference report will send for me if the same shall be brought up during my temporary absence from this body.

THE REVENUE—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I present, on behalf of the conferees on the part of the Senate, the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the House bill 12863, known as the revenue bill. I wish to state, in connection with filing the report, that upon the request of some conferees on the part of the Senate and other Senators I shall not ask for the consideration of the report at this time, but tomorrow morning as soon as the morning business is disposed of I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 15140) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "District of Columbia," on page 2, after line 18, to strike out:

PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

For payment of necessary expenses connected with the organization and conducting of community forums and civic centers in school buildings, including equipment, fixtures, and supplies for lighting and equipping the buildings, payment of janitor service, secretaries, teachers, organizers, and clerks, including the purchase of one motor vehicle for use of the central office for strictly official business not exceeding \$1,200, and maintenance of same, and employees of the day schools may also be employees of the community forums and civic centers, \$12,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to say to the Senator having charge of the bill that I had some doubts as to the advisability of striking out this provision when the matter was in the committee, but I had so little information about it that I permitted the bill to be reported with this amendment. I thought at that time this deficiency had probably been incurred largely because of the abnormal conditions in the District of Columbia while the war was going on.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is not a deficiency at all. They still have \$6,000 of the \$15,000 that was appropriated, which will certainly carry them until the next deficiency bill comes along; and if it is necessary to make any further appropriation, no harm can result by its going over until that time. I myself confess I felt some doubt about it, but I am informed there is not a present deficiency, that there is \$6,000 of unexpended money to the credit of this service, and another deficiency bill will be along very soon. I was very anxious to get this bill through, because it will save the Treasury \$15,000,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am very glad to hear that statement from the chairman of the committee. While I am not in favor of bureaus or divisions or departments of the Government creating deficiencies regardless of the amount of money that Congress may appropriate, I did think that this work is of such importance, especially under the conditions existing now, that we would hardly be justified in being too strict with this organization. Ordinarily I would not be in favor of this or any other organization for which we have appropriated money that we thought was necessary to carry on the work going on just because its appropriation ran out and proceed as if it had unlimited money to carry on its activities.

As I said, I thought there was some justification even for this organization creating a deficiency at this time, but as the chairman says there is not in fact a deficiency, and they have \$6,000 already on hand, and as we know there will be a general deficiency before the end of the month or by the first part of next month, I can not see that the work will be particularly interfered with or cramped. Therefore on that statement of the chairman I shall not oppose the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if striking out this appropriation is going to interfere with carrying on the work.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand from the chairman that it will not, that there is in fact the sum of \$6,000 still available of the appropriation we made to carry on the work, and that this is really no deficiency at all.

Mr. KENYON. What I want to get at is whether the work can still go on.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have no doubt about that. There is no reason in the world why it should not go on. There is \$6,000 on hand, and another deficiency bill will be coming along right behind, and the regular bill will not be very far behind that.

Mr. WEEKS. May I ask a question of the Senator in charge of the bill? The next item relates to the fire department. I notice in that item the heading "permanent improvements." Why do permanent improvements which seem to be original appear in this deficiency bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I understand that that appropriation became necessary because of the change from horse-drawn vehicles to motor vehicles.

Mr. WEEKS. It seems to me an appropriation of this kind should appear in the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is a deficiency.

Mr. WEEKS. Has the money been spent?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is certified to as an actual deficiency. That is the reason why it is not in the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. WEEKS. Why call them "permanent improvements"?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Because the improvement is permanent, but the appropriation was not. That resulted in a deficiency.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the chairman, in answer to the question asked by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], stated that he desired this bill to be hastened to passage as quickly as possible as it will save the Treasury of the United States \$15,000,000,000. That impression has gone out to the people generally throughout the country. In letters that I receive complaining of the passage of the revenue bill raising \$6,000,000,000, the writers state their objection owing to the fact that as long as the Treasury has \$15,000,000,000 in cash on hand, and more than that, there is no necessity for raising this amount of money.

It ought to be distinctly understood that the money is not in the Treasury of the United States at all for these purposes. There has been a part of it appropriated in the regular way that the departments of the Government can spend unless it is repealed. There is another part, and a major part of it, that are authorizations, where the appropriations have not actually been made, and of course that could not be expended by the Government until an appropriation had been made. What it means is simply that there is no repeal of legislation that has been placed upon an appropriation bill authorizing the expenditure, and there are also direct appropriations amounting to \$15,400,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Employees' Compensation Commission," on page 4, line 16, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$9,000" and insert "\$5,000," so as to make the clause read:

Not to exceed \$5,000 of the appropriation of \$25,000 for carrying on the work of the commission in France, contained in the deficiency appropriation act, approved July 8, 1918, may be expended in the District of Columbia for the purposes named in the act: *Provided*, That no per diem in lieu of subsistence shall be allowed in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department," subhead "Office of Auditor for War Department," on page 6, after line 14, to strike out:

The bureaus and offices of the Navy Department now housed in the Navy Department Annex on New York Avenue shall be removed therefrom to the Navy Office Building in Potomac Park as soon as possible and the space vacated thereby in the Navy Annex shall be occupied by the office of the Auditor for the War Department: *Provided*, That rent for the said building for the remainder of the fiscal year 1919 shall be paid by the Marine Corps.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether there are any restrictions in any law as to the compensation that may be paid to those who are employed under this authorization?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There is a restriction in the proviso on page 5, beginning at line 15.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator is in error. If he will pardon me, that relates to the Treasury Department and the general supplies of that department, whereas the item to which I have invited the Senator's attention—

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It applies to the entire appropriation.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I invite his attention to page 6, line 14. It seems to me that there is no limitation provided and the provision to which the Senator refers does not apply.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the Senator from Utah my understanding of the item. It grows out of war conditions, where it was necessary to have a very much larger force than usual for the auditors, and especially for the Auditor for the War Department. It is apparent to anyone that these clerks are not permanent, and therefore no permanent status is taken. It is necessary, not knowing the exact condition, to give a lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. KING. Was there anything before the committee which indicated the maximum that would be paid to any employee under the appropriation?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not that I know of. The auditor's office of the War Department function under the civil-service requirements, and the assumption is that the clerks will be appointed on the same basis.

Mr. KING. The Senator will keep in mind the fact that in some of the departments, where lump-sum appropriations are made and no restrictions upon the amount of compensation has been provided in the various bills, those having charge of the expenditures have gone into other departments and paid increased compensation and thus drained departments of the Government.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is undoubtedly true, but I do not think that applies to the old departments of the Government. The auditor's office of the War Department is one of the old organizations.

Mr. KING. I will say to the Senator, if he will pardon me, he is mistaken in that because the complaint was made to me by officials in some of the old departments of the Government. Complaint has been made in that way of the Treasury Department, that many of their competent clerks and employees have been taken away by some of the new bureaus, agents, and instrumentalities created during the war.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is true, but the Senator misunderstood me. I thought he meant that the old organization where they had to get additional clerks for war purposes maintained the old basis of salaries, and this is one of the old organizations and not a new one.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Virginia a question about the item? Is the Navy Department Building on New York Avenue a Government building?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the Senator that the building belongs to private persons. It was rented by the Navy Department for an annex, and now the Navy Department has informed the committee that it can move that portion of its clerical force from that building down to the new building, which belongs to the Government on B and Seventeenth Streets. The purpose was to transfer it to another department. The reason why the committee struck out the paragraph was because in the last part of the bill we propose an amendment appointing a commission to take care of the distribution of space in all public buildings, and we did not want to limit the hands of the commission, if that amendment is agreed to, by an enactment of law in reference to this particular building.

Mr. WEEKS. Is it in this building that the headquarters of the Marine Corps are now located?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; that is, it is the building on New York Avenue right opposite the Emergency Hospital.

Mr. WEEKS. I assume it is under a lease for a year?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think it is under a lease, but I think that lease is subject to cancellation by the Government.

Mr. WEEKS. The reason why I ask the question is because I think in every case where it is possible a leased building should be given up and the new building which we have constructed should be occupied.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the policy pursued in this bill.

Mr. WEEKS. Therefore the fact that it was stricken out of the bill attracted my attention.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama whether the Government would not have to pay rent for this building in the meantime after it is determined that it is no longer of use to the Government.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not sure, but my understanding is that the terms of the contract under which the building is leased can be canceled at the option of the Government. I want the Senator to understand that that is not a positive reply but that is my understanding after making some inquiry.

Mr. SHAFROTH. In view of the fact that Congress strikes this provision out of the bill, will the Government feel justified in canceling the lease for the building?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the provision in the last part of the bill providing for a commission to allocate space in the various buildings is passed and the commission determines not to occupy this building, it will have to cancel the lease.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; but how long will it be before that commission will meet?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know about that.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Is the commission to be composed of Senators and Representatives?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; it is to be composed of Senators and Representatives.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Then, it is likely we shall have to pay six months' rent on the building.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that if the House provision should remain in the bill, the building would not be vacated, for it is provided that—

The space vacated thereby in the Navy Annex shall be occupied by the office of the Auditor for the War Department.

The committee felt that there was plenty of office room in the District of Columbia for every department of the Government. It is true that the annex to the Winder Building—and that is what this is—is leased by the Government of the United States.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, in view of the explanation of the Senator from Utah, it seems to me that the amendment is a proper one.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is no doubt about it. Not only that, but I think the Government of the United States has

the right to cancel a lease which was not made within the session of Congress when payment was begun under it; in other words, that one session of Congress can not bind another to make an appropriation for a lease which was authorized by a previous Congress. I have not looked up the law, but I know from personal experience that the Government has taken that position and has so acted in the past. In the nineties, long before I was in public life, I erected a building in my home city for the Government of the United States, to be used as a courthouse. The plans were drawn by the department, the rooms were located and arranged according to those plans; the vaults were put into the middle of the building, and they ran through every story of the building.

No one would ever have constructed a building such as I then erected without a lease running for at least 10 years. The lease was made for 10 years, but that building was occupied but a few months over a year. Statehood came for our Territory; the Government had no further use for the building; it moved out; and when I asked the officials to live up to their contract they simply said: "The contract is void after the close of the Congress which was in session at the time the building was occupied." I desire to say to the Senator that in order to utilize the building for other purposes it was necessary to change the construction so as to make it almost a new building. In fact, I lost over half the cost of the building through the action of the Department of Justice.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I can readily see that that was a great hardship, but I presume that these Government leases all contain a clause providing that upon certain notice—and that notice ought to be of reasonable length, probably six months or a year—the Government shall have the right to cancel the lease of any building.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no doubt even though this language was used in the House, should the office of the Auditor of the War Department be moved into the building the Government could cancel the lease. I think the amendment offered by the committee is absolutely right and just, for I do not want to see the Government of the United States pay a dollar of rent from now on if it is possible to use the buildings which we have, and those buildings cover acres and acres of ground. So far as I am concerned, no further rents shall be paid by the Government of the United States if we have the space to house the different departments, bureaus, and divisions of our Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Contingent Expenses," on page 7, after line 2, to strike out:

For purchase of boxes, book rests, chairs, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, \$23,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "War Department," subhead "Temporary Employees," on page 7, line 23, after the word "demand," to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000," so as to read:

For the temporary employment of such additional force of clerks and other employees as in the judgment of the Secretary of War may be proper and necessary to the prompt, efficient, and accurate dispatch of official business in the War Department and its bureaus, to be allotted by the Secretary of War to such bureaus and offices as the exigencies of the existing situation may demand, \$5,000,000.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I wish we might have some explanation about this little increase of a million dollars.

Mr. KING. I am going to move to cut it down to three million.

Mr. KENYON. Perhaps it is trivial to inquire about the way we are spending Government money, but I understood we were trying to get rid of some of these clerks. The House allowed \$4,000,000 for this item of clerk hire, and it seems to be a rather large increase to raise it to \$5,000,000. What is the reason for that?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In the legislative bill, which is now pending in the Senate, the committee has cut down the number of these clerks; that is, they have refused to make an allowance for next year as to the number of additional clerks. Of course, this item applies to this year up to the 1st of July. There were a great many clerks there, and it was stated to the committee by Gen. Lord, who is acting as the financial agent of the War Department, that he must have \$6,000,000 instead of \$4,000,000, but after considering the question the committee reduced the amount of the request for an increase by Gen. Lord to \$5,000,000; in other words, we gave them a million dollars more than the House did on his statement that he would otherwise fall short.

Mr. KENYON. Was Gen. Lord before the House committee, I will ask the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think he was.

Mr. KENYON. And all of his evidence was given to the House committee, and they allowed only \$4,000,000?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They allowed \$4,000,000; but after the Senate committee heard Gen. Lord and received a letter from Secretary Baker on this subject, which, if the Senator from Iowa desires me to do so, I shall send to the Secretary's desk and have read, we took this action.

Mr. KENYON. I should be very glad to have the Senator have the letter read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read, as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 31, 1919.

HON. THOMAS S. MARTIN,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: I feel very strongly that the department will need all of the \$6,000,000 which has been estimated for as necessary for the pay of additional temporary employees till June 30, if the limited-service men who have been on duty in the various bureaus are discharged from the service, which in a large number of cases will require the appointment of civilians to replace them.

The estimates submitted to me by the bureaus aggregate nearly \$9,000,000, or, to be exact, \$8,785,082.85. In my desire to cooperate to the utmost with Congress in securing the reduction of this temporary force now that the great emergency which had called it into existence had in large measure diminished, I made an arbitrary cut of about 32 per cent, reducing it to \$6,000,000, which was the amount submitted. I am now inclined to think that if the reduction made is adhered to it will prove more costly to the Government in the end. In the desire to hasten as rapidly as possible the restoration to normal conditions, I perhaps gave too little consideration to the fact that the \$9,000,000 estimated for by the bureaus contemplated the necessity of replacing limited-service men on duty in various bureaus. The total number of such men on duty at the time of the signing of the armistice was 5,811. January 1 it had been reduced to 2,823, and the discharge of limited-service men is proceeding steadily under the plan of military demobilization.

The pay roll for additional employees for December was, in round numbers, \$1,602,000, and the average number of employees on the roll during that month was 16,111. The net reduction of this force from November 11 to December 31 was 1,506 employees. I am inclosing a table showing that on the basis of a deficiency appropriation of \$6,000,000, it would be necessary to separate from the service 6,611 employees by June 30, or at the average rate of over 1,100 a month from January 1. If the reduction should be continued at the same rate, the force would be reduced by November 30, 1919, to 4,000 people, making a reduction of 13,500 in a year's time from the signing of the armistice. It seems to me that, all things considered, such a reduction as this contemplates is the maximum that it would be wise to make at this time, and I feel this all the more strongly because it is clear that the discharge of the limited-service men will necessitate a large number of new appointments, which I did not have immediately in mind at the time I made the arbitrary reduction from \$9,000,000 to \$6,000,000 in the estimates that were submitted to me by the chiefs of bureaus.

Very truly, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Statement showing the proposed rate of expenditure for additional employees for the balance of this fiscal year based upon a deficiency appropriation of \$6,000,000.

| Month. | Estimated payroll. | Average number employees (estimated). | Estimated decrease. | |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| | | | Payroll. | Number employees. |
| December ¹ | \$1,602,000 | 16,111 | | |
| January ² | 1,450,000 | 14,500 | \$152,000 | 1,611 |
| February ² | 1,300,000 | 13,000 | 150,000 | 1,500 |
| March ² | 1,200,000 | 12,000 | 100,000 | 1,000 |
| April ² | 1,100,000 | 11,000 | 100,000 | 1,000 |
| May ² | 1,000,000 | 10,000 | 100,000 | 1,000 |
| June ² | 950,000 | 9,500 | 50,000 | 500 |
| | 8,602,000 | | 652,000 | 6,611 |
| Deduct: | | | | |
| December roll paid..... | \$1,602,000 | | | |
| January 15 roll paid..... | 741,000 | | | |
| Balance of appropriation (approximate)..... | 304,000 | | | |
| | 2,647,000 | | | |
| | 5,955,000 | | | |

¹ Actual.

² Estimated.

The additional force on November 11, 1918, was in round number 17,500. To get down to 9,500 by June 30 will be a reduction of 46 per cent in seven and two-third months or at the rate of about 1,050 a month.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that in his testimony before the committee, on page 13, Gen. Lord made this statement:

As I stated, I called a meeting yesterday of the representatives of the bureaus as to this deficiency, as to this \$4,000,000 for the balance of this year, and went over with them very carefully their needs, and

went into the items of the particular need that made it necessary that they should have any particular number of additional employees; and the total of their estimate called for 14,252 additional employees between now and June 30.

And then he inserted the table.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Alabama permit an interruption?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. KING. Are the 14,000 clerks, which the Senator just mentioned, in addition to the 12,000 or 14,000 or 16,000 which the department now has?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I do not so understand. But it means that the department had about 15,000 clerks before, and the Secretary now thinks between this time and the end of the fiscal year he will need 14,252. He has lost a number of clerks who were working for the War Department on soldier's pay. Of course there is a very great difference between a typewriter working for \$30 a month as a soldier and a typewriter working for \$100 or \$125 a month as a civilian.

I think I am in accord with the view expressed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] that the number of clerks employed in the departments should be largely cut down; I think the good service of the Government requires that; I think that they have too many clerks; that what we need is more efficiency and fewer clerks; but with the large number of telegrams that are pouring into the War Department about the men in Europe, the large amount of correspondence that is coming there now about the American Expeditionary Forces, I think we should be safer if we allowed this additional million dollars as an actual deficit than we would be to strike it out of the bill. Therefore I want to ask the Senator from Iowa at least to allow the additional million dollars to remain in the bill, so as to allow the matter to go to conference. If in conference we find, after discussing the matter with the other House, that we can get along without it, of course, the Senate conferees will agree that it go out; but if we strike it out now we shall have a hard and fast rule to hold them down to \$4,000,000. This is a deficit; it is not something that can be taken care of in the future. We may make a mistake in an appropriation contained in an annual appropriation bill and later in the year, if we have not provided sufficient money, we may make it up as a deficit; but this is a deficiency; and, if we do not give the money, these clerks will have to be discharged.

Mr. KENYON. Is it not true that they are calling for a large number of additional clerks between now and June 30, according to the testimony of Gen. Lord?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think they desire additional clerks.

Mr. KENYON. How could there be a deficiency if these are to be used as additional clerks?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is a deficiency incurred in running the department. I think the deficiency is caused to some extent by the discharge from the service of enlisted men who were serving in the clerical force there. It is due also to the fact that Gen. Harris, The Adjutant General of the Army, is calling for, I think, 6,000 clerks to take care of the congested condition of the mail in his office. I do not think it is necessary for us to bring in proof that there is a congested condition in that office.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I think there is a congestion of clerks, and I think they would do more efficient work if there were fewer of them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am in accord with the Senator, and in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill we refused to authorize many items of this kind. In that bill, however, we can afford to do so, for, if we make a mistake, we can take care of it in the future; but I think it would be unwise to strike out the additional million dollars provided for in this item.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Iowa that I was unfavorably impressed with the proposition of granting more than \$4,000,000 until I made a thorough examination of the situation in the War Department. There have been 1,046 enlisted men on duty in the various offices of the War Department who have left that department since November 11. There was a total number of 4,917 at the date of the signing of the armistice, while on January 31 of this year that number has been decreased, as I have it, by 1,046. The reason for this appropriation, however, is not found in that decrease of 1,046 enlisted men who were there employed. The estimate made by the Secretary of the Treasury for \$6,000,000 shows that it was to pay for the original demands of the War Department for 14,250 employees for five and one-half months at an average of \$1,200 a year, making a total expenditure of \$7,838,000. That was, as has been stated, cut down to \$6,000,000 in the estimates. Then the House cut that sum to \$4,000,000, but the showing made by Gen. Lord was such that the committee thought

the safest way was to increase the appropriation by \$1,000,000, in view of the work that has been imposed upon the War Department since the signing of the armistice, involving the closing of accounts in France, the transfers there being made, and particularly the work in The Adjutant General's office, which has immensely increased. In fact, Gen. Harris made the statement that unless they had 6,000 additional employees it would be almost next to impossible for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance to arrange for the settlements due the injured soldiers and the allotments to the families of soldiers, the delay in connection with which all of us have so bitterly complained of in the past. It was for that reason that I thought perhaps it would be better to give this million dollar increase.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Iowa that when this matter came up before the subcommittee having charge of this bill I think it was the unanimous feeling of the committee that this item should not be increased beyond the amount contained in the bill as it came to us from the House. Gen. Lord and Gen. Harris came before the committee and insisted upon making a showing as to the necessity for it; and they showed so clearly the overwhelming necessity for it, that we added \$1,000,000. In my judgment, assuming their statements to be correct—and we have no reason to think they are not—it would have been wisdom on the part of the committee to have given them the \$6,000,000 asked for, because they showed clearly that, in their judgment, at any rate, from their knowledge of the conditions in their offices, they would need \$6,000,000 between now and the 1st of July in order to do what is actually necessary to be done in connection with the demobilization of the Army and to discharge the work that has been imposed upon the department since the armistice.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JONES of Washington. In just a moment. We all know of the complaints that come to us from the country with reference to delays and the failure to hear from the boys, the failure to get information regarding them, and all that sort of thing, and we know of the requests for discharge, and of the letters inquiring why discharges are not made more rapidly. Gen. Lord and Gen. Harris both stated that, unless they got this money, the work in their department would be absolutely demoralized; that it would be so congested that that of itself would cause additional delay and make additional expense. So the committee felt that it was absolutely necessary to make this increase, and, as I have stated, in my judgment, the showing warranted a larger increase than we made.

Now I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have recently been at the War Department, indeed, I have been there very frequently during the past two or three months, and I have been there a number of times during the past few weeks. According to my observation, many of the clerks are doing but very, very little, and many who are there employed now could be dispensed with. I recall going into one office a few days ago, where I saw seven stenographers who told me they had only had two letters during the entire day.

Mr. JONES of Washington. What branch of the War Department was that?

Mr. KING. That was in the munitions building. My observation is that there is a lack of system, a lack of economy in the clerical work of the War Department. I think that it is wrong to give this amount. If I had my way I would cut it down to \$4,000,000. I think that if we told Secretary Baker and his aids that \$4,000,000 is all they could have the work would be done.

A lady who is at the head of one branch and has some 20 or 30 clerks under her immediate supervision told me that it was difficult to get work out of those who were under her, and that the same condition existed elsewhere in the department. When I asked her why she did not discharge them or recommend for discharge those who are incompetent, inefficient, and inept, or who refused or failed to do their duty, she stated, in substance, that it was a very difficult thing to get anyone discharged, and her intimation was that it would not be approved by those who are her superiors.

From my observation, I make bold to charge that there is gross inefficiency in the War Department. I refer now to the handling of the work by the clerks in the War Department. I will not at this time pretend to state who is at fault, but I think some of the chiefs of divisions and bureaus are censurable for inefficiency and for the waste that is going on in the War Department. I not only hope that the committee amendment will be disagreed to, but, if the opportunity is afforded, I shall move to make this appropriation not more than \$4,000,000. I have no doubt in the world that, if the clerks will do their duty and if the higher officials in the department will also do their duty, the work can be done for \$4,000,000.

I think it is about time that some of these various departments were taught that they may not create divisions and employ, without limit, any number of clerks that their fancy or caprice impels them to employ and then call upon Congress to make appropriations to pay them. There ought to be some economy in the administration of the affairs of the Government in these various departments. I ask the Senator now if, notwithstanding the pressure of business that is alleged, any of the departments have asked their employees to work eight hours a day?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not know as to that.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact that they have not done so, although the law specifically requires that they shall do so when there is a pressure of business?

Mr. JONES of Washington. As I understand, the law authorizes the heads of the departments to require the clerks to work overtime if necessary, but I do not know that any orders have been issued of that nature. I do know, however, that I have been informed by some of the heads of some of the bureaus in the Quartermaster General's Office—I do not know what the conditions are in other branches of the War Department—that they have asked their clerks to work overtime and that the clerks have done so, and have done so cheerfully.

Mr. KING. That is the only branch of the public service here, to my knowledge, where such a policy has been pursued.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That may be true. I have no doubt that there is much basis for the suggestions and the criticism the Senator makes. I do not know that, however, from personal knowledge or personal observation. I do know that I have been brought in contact with some of the officials of the Quartermaster General's Office and, in my judgment, that office is being handled just about as efficiently as it is possible to do it under the circumstances; that is, I am satisfied that the head of that branch or division of the War Department is doing everything in his power to do his work efficiently. I know that he does not want to stay in the Army; I know that he does not want to stay in the position that he is in, and that he is staying there simply as a patriotic duty. He may not be efficient; I do not know; I believe that he is, and I believe that he is handling the work about as well as any man could handle it.

I think I appreciate the difficulties that the head of a department or the head of a great organization in the War Department must face in trying to get effective service out of his subordinates. Of course, that depends very largely upon the ability and the executive capacity of the heads of the bureaus, their relationship with their employees, and the feeling that exists between them and their employees. One man will get splendid service out of a corps of a hundred men and women under him while another man would probably not get half the work out of the same force. I have been in some branches of the Quartermaster General's office and, so far as my observation could go, good work was being done and everybody seemed to be busy. Just what they were accomplishing, of course, I can not say; and the committee, my recollection is, had no information as to the needs of any branch of the War Department except the Quartermaster General's office and The Adjutant General's office. Unless we are absolutely and wholly to discredit these men, we must give them this money or run the risk of disorganizing the service.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. May I ask the Senator whether this information came before the House committee, and if so, how does it happen that they made the amount \$4,000,000?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not know.

Mr. KENYON. According to the letter of the Secretary of War the amount must be \$6,000,000 to save the force from being demoralized.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not think the Secretary knows very much about that. He just gets his information from the other officials; but I want the Senator to bear this in mind: I think it would have been better for us to have made it \$6,000,000, and I do not believe that the letter of the Secretary was laid before the subcommittee. I do not remember ever hearing of that letter before; but the Secretary states that the recommendations to him amounted to about \$9,000,000, and he simply cut that amount, arbitrarily, 33 per cent. In other words, he had absolutely no reason whatever for cutting it down unless he distrusted the capacity and the ability of those who submitted the estimate to him to submit a proper estimate. If these are the right kind of men, who know what they are doing, we ought to have the right to think that their estimate of \$9,000,000 is more nearly what will actually be necessary for them to do the work that they have to do than \$6,000,000. This

\$6,000,000 was simply arrived at, in an arbitrary sort of way, by cutting off 33 per cent.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, is not that so about every request that comes to us?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think very likely it is.

Mr. KENYON. An arbitrary sum is fixed, and we are told that if they do not get it things are going to be demoralized; and so we go ahead and vote whatever they ask.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Well, no; I do not know of any item that has been before the Appropriations Committee for which the necessity was so clearly shown as this item, unless we are not to place any reliance whatever on these men who come down before us. Gen. Lord and Gen. Harris were there. Gen. Lord, who made the principal statement before the committee, impressed me as a patriotic man. He impressed me as a man who is trying to get the very best possible service out of the force in his department, and he impressed me as a man who knows something about the work he has to do. I may be mistaken about it, but that is the way it impressed me.

It may be that the clerks under him are not doing the work that they ought to do. I do not know about that; but that is a matter of administration that will have to be cared for in an administrative way. We can not make clerks do more work by simply cutting down appropriations. If they are not doing the work they ought to do, they ought to be dismissed and clerks put in who will do it; and if the bureau chiefs are not looking after their clerical help as they ought to do it, then they ought to be gotten rid of. When the head of a department that has to do with the discharging of these men and sending them to their homes as quickly as possible comes in here and says that unless this money is appropriated the work can not be done, I think we ought to discharge our responsibility and provide the money, and then place the responsibility of failure where it really belongs.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MOSES. I should like to ask the Senator if either of these generals appearing before the committee specified the bureaus or divisions in their department in which the work is in arrears, where these clerks are needed, and where demoralization will result if they are not provided?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Practically in all their lines of work. The Quartermaster General's office has a certain line of work in connection with demobilization and in connection with the Army. I do not know the exact scope of it, but I took it that it applied to their work generally, to each of these two divisions or departments, or whatever they may be called.

Mr. MOSES. In other words, this is another one of those cases in which Congress is told, "If I do not receive this ungrudgingly, I shall not know how to deal with other more important matters," and then no information is given us as to what those other more important matters are?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No, Mr. President; that is not correct. That is correct in the case of some of the requests that come from some of the executive branches of the Government, but it is not correct with reference to this particular item or request of the Quartermaster General's office. Gen. Lord did not refuse to answer a single question of the committee. He came there and was ready to give us all the information that we asked for. He explained just as fully as the committee saw fit to allow him to go into the matter. If we had seen fit to ask him with reference to the particular bureaus or particular bureau chiefs, or the duties of a particular bureau or a particular bureau chief, I have not any doubt in the world but that he would have gone into it fully. There was no attempt at concealment on his part at all.

Mr. MOSES. If, in my absence, the Senator has given the information which I am about to ask for, I will not ask him to repeat it; but did the committee elicit from either of these generals—Gen. Lord or Gen. Harris—the number of clerks now employed in their branches of the department, and how many more could be employed for the additional \$1,000,000?

Mr. JONES of Washington. My recollection is that they stated about the number of employees they have, although I am not sure; but Gen. Lord did state, according to my recollection, that they would need from 13,000 to 14,000 more clerks between now and the 1st of July to do the work that they felt they would have to do in order to anything like keep up with the demands in connection with the demobilization of the troops. I think about six or seven thousand of those would be required for The Adjutant General's Office, and the remainder for the Quartermaster General's office. I think that is the statement he made. Those would be the employees, not for the \$1,000,000 but for the \$6,000,000 that they asked for. The House gave them \$4,000,000, and we gave an additional \$1,000,000, making it \$5,000,000 to take care of these employees.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I am not competent to speak for Gen. Lord, but so far as Gen. Harris's office is concerned I have not noticed any very considerable delay in replying to communications which I have sent there. On the contrary, I think the replies from The Adjutant General's Office have been more prompt and more satisfactory than from any other of the offices in the War Department with which I have had occasion to do business; and in view of the information which I have growing out of my own experience in conducting business with The Adjutant General's Office, I can not see how additional money could advance that work very much. When one can make inquiry about an individual in an Army as large as ours and receive a detailed reply in three or four days, as I have most frequently in addressing inquiries there, I should think that was nearly the acme of expedition in sending out and giving information.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to say to the Senator that it used to be so that when we sent a letter to The Adjutant General's Office one day we got a reply the next day. That was almost uniformly true.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I can tell the Senator now the number of employees that there were in the department on November 1, 1918, and the estimated number that will be required during the balance of the fiscal year.

On November 1, 1918, there were employed in the War Department 17,156. It is estimated that there will be employed an average, during the fiscal year 1920, of 10,140 additional employees over and above the number that were originally employed in the War Department before the declaration of war; and now it is estimated that they will require for the balance of this fiscal year, up to June 30, 1919, 14,586.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, may I draw from the encyclopedic knowledge of the Senator from Utah whether this augmented number of employees will be required after the 30th day of June, and if so, how long?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Senator desires, I can give the number that will be required after June 30 in every office, as I have it here; but it would take too long a time. I wish to say, however, that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, it is estimated that over 15,000 employees will be required in the War Department; and in that connection, Mr. President, if the legislation is passed that has been asked for by the introduction of bills in the House and in the Senate—and I will admit that I introduced, at the request of the adjutant general of my State, a similar bill, not knowing what it was going to cost the Government of the United States when I introduced it—if that legislation passes, requiring the Government of the United States to compile information as to the complete record of every soldier who was in the war, whether serving in this country or in France, and send that information to the adjutant general of every State, it will take over 1,000 additional employees to do it.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah has, in compact tabulated form, the information of which he speaks, showing the number of employees who will be required in all of the different bureaus after the close of the present fiscal year, will he be good enough to put it in the RECORD in connection with his remarks? He need not bother to read it.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask, then, that there may be printed in connection with what I have stated, if the Senate has no objection, this tabulated statement, showing the total additional number of employees January 31, 1919, the total enlisted men employed January 31, 1919, the grand total employed, and then the estimated number for the balance of the year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Statement showing number of additional employees and enlisted men on hand in the various offices of the War Department January 31, 1919, and number of additional employees required for balance of year (5½ months).

| | Total additional employees Jan. 31, 1919. | Total enlisted men employed Jan. 31, 1919. | Total. | Estimated number for balance of year. |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--------|---------------------------------------|
| Secretary of War..... | 471 | | 474 | 1,265 |
| Adjutant General's Office..... | 3,592 | 251 | 4,143 | 6,000 |
| Judge Advocate General..... | 89 | 40 | 129 | 119 |
| Inspector General..... | 39 | 3 | 42 | 39 |
| Signal Corps..... | 273 | 98 | 371 | 200 |
| Quartermaster General..... | 2,900 | 378 | 3,278 | 12,392 |
| Surgeon General..... | 1,219 | 37 | 1,256 | 850 |
| Ordnance Department..... | 4,028 | 73 | 4,701 | 13,355 |

! Average.

Statement showing number of additional employees, etc.—Continued.

| | Total additional employees Jan. 31, 1919. | Total enlisted men employed Jan. 31, 1919. | Total. | Estimated number for balance of year. |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--------|---------------------------------------|
| Engineer Department..... | 211 | 35 | 246 | 211 |
| Bureau of Insular Affairs..... | 13 | | 13 | 13 |
| Militia Bureau..... | 11 | | 11 | 11 |
| Chemical Warfare..... | 118 | 10 | 128 | 92 |
| Coast Artillery..... | 38 | 3 | 41 | 33 |
| General Staff..... | 401 | 67 | 468 | 338 |
| Tank Corps..... | 6 | 1 | 7 | 10 |
| Motor Transport Corps..... | 268 | 50 | 318 | 268 |
| War Credits Board..... | 6 | | 6 | 6 |
| Total..... | 14,586 | 1,046 | 15,632 | 14,252 |

14,252 employees for 5½ months, at \$1,200 per year, \$7,838,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, just a word, and I am through.

I do not know how it is with other Senators, but I know that my work has more than trebled since the armistice was signed. The requests coming from parents with reference to their boys, repeated over and over again, and requests from boys to get out, have more than trebled since the armistice came on. Now, if my work has trebled and the work of other Senators has trebled in that way, I can very easily see how the work of the War Department must have been very greatly increased; and it will continue until we reach the peak and begin to go down on the other side of getting these boys out of the Army.

Mr. President, if there is any increase as to the necessity of which I have been satisfied upon the showing made by the men who were responsible for the work that must be done, it is the increase that we have made here; and the only fear I have is that we have not given them an ample increase to discharge the burdens that will be placed upon them.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I wish to add a word to what has been said relating to this paragraph. I am not confident that it is necessary to add a million dollars to it. I have not given that matter careful consideration, and I do not know that it can be done at this time; and yet I want to say that in my judgment, if there were a proper redistribution of employees from one bureau to another in the War Department, it would not be necessary to add anything to the appropriation.

There were 1,500 employees in the casualty office at the end of the war. On the 27th of November the Chief of Staff announced, as the result of a cablegram from Gen. Pershing, that there were 264,000 casualties in the Army. Naturally, there have been a few from disease since that time; but there have been practically 240,000 casualties now reported to the public, and I presume by the end of February or some time in March that number will have been covered. Then, there will be 1,500 employees who can not be required for that particular service, and I want to suggest to Senators that unless Congress cuts off these employees they will be continued in the positions which they hold as long as there is a possible excuse to keep them there.

I was informed not long ago that in looking around for quarters in the District of Columbia at the beginning of the war, when there was great demand for additional accommodations, somebody found, out in the southwest section of the city, a considerable number of men and women employed in compiling and sorting records of the War of 1812, 108 years before. That is simply indicative of what we will have from this very much greater war unless Congress is assured that men and women are discharged when their services are not absolutely essential to the Government. I do not think we can depend upon the heads of bureaus to take that step in all cases. I think it must be taken by cutting off the appropriations.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I saw the other day a report purporting to emanate from the Government, in which it was stated that there had only been a reduction of 3,000 employees in all of the departments since the armistice from the peak which had been reached during the progress of the war; in other words, that there were only 3,000 less now than there were when the highest number of employees were in the various departments of the Government; and in some of the departments they have increased the number.

Mr. WEEKS. What the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] has stated is undoubtedly true in the cases of many Senators; and yet that condition must be getting better every day as men are discharged from the service. The correspondence which the Senators and Representatives and the department are having will gradually decrease; and there should be

some means of compelling a gradual decrease, at the same rate, of the number of employees who may not be needed.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator having this bill in charge, referring to the department to which the Senator from Massachusetts has just referred, the casualty department, in which it was stated that there were 1,500 clerks employed, whether this bill makes provision for compensation for them in any way; whether there is any deficiency claimed with respect to that department?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There was no testimony before the committee with reference to those particular clerks; and of course any clerks that are on the rolls are being paid out of sums that were appropriated in the past. This additional appropriation has nothing to do with that proposition.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator know whether there is any provision in any appropriation bill or in any other enactment requiring these various heads of departments to dismiss and discharge their employees when they cease to have sufficient work for them to do?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to my friend from Utah that if we ever get this bill through, we will do more to clear up the situation he is talking about than any bill that has ever been before Congress, because, while the first two pages of this bill take care of deficiencies, the last pages of the bill cover back into the Treasury cash that has already been appropriated for the Army to the amount of \$6,856,835,124.70, and to the Navy \$334,361,866.98, making a total of cash covered back into the Treasury, in the Army and Navy Departments, of \$7,191,196,991.98. The bill also cancels the following contractual obligations that are now outstanding: For the Army, \$8,190,629,294.70; for the Navy, \$31,000,000; making a total of contractual obligations that are being canceled by this bill of \$8,221,029,294.70; or a total cancellation of cash that is covered back into the Treasury and contract obligations that are canceled of \$15,412,266,286.38.

I know of no more effective way of limiting abuse in the expenditure of money than to put it back in the Treasury, and this bill is accomplishing more along that line than any piece of legislation that ever passed the Congress of the United States; so that the question of the smaller items that we are discussing now is insignificant in comparison with what will be accomplished if we are enabled to pass the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. KING. Of course the figures to which the Senator has just called attention were based upon appropriations made and contracts authorized, but which appropriations have not been contracted for or expended, and which the War Department, or the various other departments to which the credits were given, would not proceed to expend, or contract to expend, even though this bill were not enacted into law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The presumption, of course, is as the Senator says, but we are turning this money back into the Treasury so that there will be no presumption about it.

Mr. SMOOT. Not back into the Treasury. We have not got the money.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, we are canceling the cash obligations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, some Senators were called out, and they asked, if this matter came to a vote before they got back, to have a quorum called. I promised them I would do it, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---------------|----------------|--------------|------------|
| Ashurst | Johnson, Cal. | Myers | Smith, Ga. |
| Baird | Jones, N. Mex. | Nugent | Smoot |
| Bankhead | Jones, Wash. | Overman | Spencer |
| Cott | Kellogg | Page | Sterling |
| Cummins | King | Penrose | Sutherland |
| Curtis | Kirby | Polindexter | Thomas |
| Dillingham | La Follette | Pollock | Trammell |
| Fletcher | Lenroot | Pomerene | Underwood |
| Frelinghuysen | Lewis | Ransdell | Wadsworth |
| Gay | Lodge | Robinson | Walsh |
| Gerry | McCumber | Saulsbury | Warren |
| Hale | McKellar | Shafroth | Weeks |
| Hardwick | Martin, Va. | Sheppard | Wolcott |
| Henderson | Moses | Smith, Ariz. | |

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] on official business. This announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 9, after the word "each," to strike out the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of any appropriation herein shall be used unless all former Government employees who have been drafted or enlisted in the military service of the United States in the war with Germany shall be reinstated on application to their former positions appropriated for herein, if they have received an honorable discharge and are qualified to perform the duties of the position.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this provision in relation to the reemployment of soldiers was stricken out because it was a mere limitation on the appropriation in this bill, and has been put by the House as a limitation on the appropriations in other bills. In the legislative bill instead of leaving it as a limitation on the appropriation, we changed it so that it would be a matter of general law and would not have to be carried on every bill. We thought at the time the legislative bill was reported that it would go through first, and therefore this should be stricken out; but in order that there may be no mistake about it, if there is no objection, I will move to amend it so that it will conform to what was the recommendation of the committee in reference to the legislative bill and make it the existing law for all bills. I move to amend by striking out of the bill the words reported to be stricken out by the committee and add a period after the word "each" in line 9, page 8, and then to insert the following language as a separate paragraph:

That all former Government employees who have been drafted or enlisted in the military service of the United States in the war with Germany shall be reinstated on application to their former positions, if they have received an honorable discharge and are qualified to perform the duties of the position.

That is what the House passed, except that the House passed it as a limitation on an appropriation. We recommend it as a permanent piece of legislation.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Navy Department," subhead "Contingent expenses," on page 10, line 6, after the words "Navy Department," to strike out "\$2,570.84" and insert "2,614.84," so as to make the clause read:

For rental of additional quarters for the Navy Department, \$2,614.84.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 21 on page 15.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee a question in regard to these items. I have seen it stated that under this bill we save \$15,000,000,000. I see very large appropriations here. How is that saving effected?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. They are appropriations made heretofore by law which are revoked.

Mr. LODGE. It revokes the other appropriations?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. These are additional appropriations. These are deficiencies, and in the bill later on there is a repeal.

Mr. LODGE. I had not looked at that part of the bill. I wanted to know where those appropriations have been revoked.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. We shall come to it in a very little while.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator from Massachusetts will turn to page 20, line 6, he will see where the repealing clause commences in reference to these appropriations.

Mr. LODGE. I will wait until we get to that page, and then I will ask the Senator about it.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask the chairman if these large amounts on page 15 are all deficiencies.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. They are actual deficiencies. They have been actually incurred and estimated and certified as such.

Mr. SMOOT. They apply to different departments of the Navy from those where more than was necessary was appropriated.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is true.

Mr. SMOOT. Those where more than was necessary was appropriated are repealed, and these departments have fallen short of what they actually had to have?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is the case.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to page 19, on line 7. The last paragraph read being as follows:

To pay the widow of Jacob E. Meeker, late a Representative from the State of Missouri, \$7,500.

Mr. ROBINSON. I offer an amendment and call the attention of the chairman of the committee to it. I move to strike out lines 6 and 7, on page 19, and to insert:

To pay to the legal guardian of Dolan Meeker, Naomi Meeker, Miriam Meeker, and Louise Meeker, minor children of Jacob E. Meeker, late a Representative from the State of Missouri, \$7,500.

I think the chairman of the committee is familiar with the exceptional circumstances in this case, and I will ask the chairman if he feels that he is in a position to accept the amendment and let it go to conference.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I hesitate very much to make a change about a matter that belongs peculiarly to the House. Under the comity between the two Houses each is expected to control its own expenditures. This is for the family of a deceased Member of the House, and it seems to me that the House membership ought to be in a better position and better entitled to determine the disposition of the fund than the Senate could be.

Mr. ROBINSON. I understand the Senator declines to accept the amendment. Am I correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I would rather not. I am entirely without information on the subject.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I am perfectly well aware of the custom which prevails in Congress of paying the widows of deceased Members of Congress \$7,500. It is general legislation, and it is, of course, based upon the assumption of dependency. I stated that the facts in this case are exceptional. Under the facts which, I think, are known to practically every Member of the Senate I believe these minor children should have the benefit of this provision and that this appropriation should not go to the widow. The facts, as I understand them—

Mr. SPENCER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SPENCER. Does the Senator from Arkansas know that Mr. Meeker at his death left \$30,000 of insurance, \$10,000 of which was used to pay his debts and \$20,000 for the minor children, the widow securing none of the insurance?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. SPENCER. The only provision for the widow, if it is allowed to stand, being this provision which the House has inserted.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes. I was just about to state that some time prior to his death Mr. Meeker was divorced from a former wife and left the four children whom I have named in the amendment, the youngest being 5 years of age. He did carry, as I am informed by a letter from the former widow, policies of insurance for the benefit of his minor children. His estate was badly involved. Seven hours before his death, in anticipation of his death and for the express purpose of depriving his legal heirs—those who otherwise would have been his legal heirs—of this provision he married his former clerk.

Those are the circumstances, extremely exceptional, which I believe make it the duty of Congress to see that this money goes to those who were in fact dependent upon Jacob E. Meeker and to whom he owed an obligation.

I do not know that there is anything further I can state concerning the matter. My information is that when the allowance which, under the statutes of Missouri, goes to his widow has been paid, when her dower interest in his personal property has been paid to her, there will be very little left except the insurance to provide for the minor children. The mere fact that he made some inadequate provision for the support of the children does not, in my judgment, justify Congress in setting the precedent which would be set in this case if this amendment is not adopted.

The matter was not called to the attention of the House of Representatives. Twenty-five Members of the House have solicited me to offer this amendment, and I do it in the firm conviction that the Senate has a duty in this matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator any information as to whether this is a statutory allowance or is it just a custom of the two Houses that has grown up?

Mr. ROBINSON. There is no statute. It is a pure gratuity which the Congress has customarily granted to the dependents of a dead Member, and if it has any justification in reason or in principle it is the obligation of Congress to pay it to those who were dependent upon the deceased Member.

Mr. McKELLAR. Are the children minor children, and how many are there?

Mr. ROBINSON. They are minor children and they are four in number. I can give the ages as represented to me: Dolan, 17 years; Naomi, 17 years; Miriam, 9; and Louise, 5.

Mr. McKELLAR. How long had he been divorced?

Mr. ROBINSON. I can not state. That is all I desire to submit upon the subject.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I hold no brief for Mrs. Meeker in this case. I did not know the matter was coming up, but I do know the facts in the case. Mr. Meeker was my friend, and the Representative in Congress from the city where I live.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is misinformed as to the facts. It is true that seven hours before Mr. Meeker died he married a lady who had been employed in his office, but it is not true that the marriage was for the purpose of giving

any estate away from the children, because the marriage had been arranged and a home had been arranged and furnished in Washington weeks before. The marriage had been arranged for November, which was four or five weeks after the Representative died.

Mr. McKELLAR. Whatever the purpose or whether there was any such purpose, would not the ordinary and natural effect of the marriage just before his death take this \$7,500 away from the minor children?

Mr. SPENCER. The reason that would appeal to my mind would be the fact that long before his death a house had been secured and furnished for their occupancy upon their marriage, which was to have occurred late in November had not death intervened. That had all been arranged, the marriage was fixed, and then when Mr. Meeker suddenly without warning was taken ill and the doctors said he was upon the eve of death he called in the judge of one of the circuit courts to perform the marriage ceremony.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPENCER. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. I understand the Senator to say that as a matter of fact the date for the marriage had been set at a time which was actually subsequent to the time of the death of the Congressman who, in anticipation of death and knowing that he was probably to die, arranged to consummate the marriage earlier?

Mr. SPENCER. The Senator is quite right. A house has been furnished and everything that the Senator and myself would be expected to do previous to marriage has been arranged between these two. There was nothing unusual in it. The only unusual circumstance in connection with the matter was that death intervened, and on the eve of death the man himself sought to have the marriage ceremony performed sooner than it would otherwise have been performed.

Mr. ROBINSON. What was the object of that?

Mr. SPENCER. I presume it was to get married.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator makes a jest of a very solemn matter. The Senator has said that the man knew he was within a few hours of his death, and I think the Senator can not seriously say that he expected this lady to perform the obligation and the relationship of a wife to him in fact.

Mr. SPENCER. If I may answer the Senator, the thing that appealed to me and appeals to me now is that every ordinary provision for marriage had been made before his sickness, which to my mind absolutely controverts any idea of marriage upon the deathbed merely for the purpose of taking away from the children the money which otherwise might have been expected to go to them.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. SPENCER. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. What provision did he make for his little children?

Mr. SPENCER. The Senator from Utah evidently was out of the Chamber when I answered that question previously. Mr. Meeker left \$30,000 of insurance. Ten thousand dollars of the insurance was used to pay his debts. Every dollar of the remaining \$20,000 went to the children and not one dollar to the widow. It is but fair that the record should show that long before his death Mr. Meeker, in taking up the question of this insurance, suggested that the insurance policies be transferred to the woman whom he was about to marry, and upon her solicitation the insurance was allowed to remain where it was at the hour of his death—payable entirely to his children. Outside of that insurance money I am informed there is a piece of land heavily encumbered, but, as my information goes, of substantially no value. So the only thing the man left was his insurance and this possible contingent gratuity which might come from Congress and which is now in question.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPENCER. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Do I understand from the Senator that it was the desire of Mr. Meeker to deprive his children of this insurance and it was on the protest of the lady who afterwards became his wife that that desire was not carried out?

Mr. SPENCER. The information as it comes to me is that the insurance, all payable to his children, ought in fairness to have had some division in connection with it, the same provision that would have been made by law if it had not been insurance but had been property otherwise. I understand it was Mr. Meeker's intention not to cut out the children, but to proportion the amount between the children and his wife, because a part of the insurance money which went to pay his debt was to pay an allowance which the court had made to his former wife, and that of course was paid in full.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] whether it would not be an equitable distribution of this \$7,500 to give one half of it to the widow and the other half to the children. That is the way in which it would be distributed if the person had died in my State without any will. In view of the fact that at present there is no law which controls it, and inasmuch as it is subject to our discretion as to what shall be done with it, I believe it would be fair to give to the wife one half and to the children the other half.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I really know nothing in the world about the moral obligation which Mr. Meeker owed to his wife and to his children. We have had no opportunity or occasion to investigate those obligations. All we know is that if there is anything about which the two Houses of Congress are jealous it is the right of each House to control its expenditures for its own Members. Mr. Meeker was a Member of the House, and the House has made such disposition of this matter as it saw fit. It seems the children already have \$20,000, and all the widow can possibly get is this gratuity from Congress. Mr. Meeker saw fit to make this lady his wife, and she is now his widow. He was a Member of Congress, and he no doubt knew the custom of Congress in this respect. At any rate, the responsibility is on the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives has given this money to the widow, and if that is not done by the Senate it will be a violation of the comity that for many years has existed between the two Houses and will no doubt lead to acrimonious controversy when the conference committee meets. I hope the Senate will observe the long-established rule and permit the House to dispose of this matter as it sees fit.

Mr. ROBINSON. The logic of the statement of the Senator from Missouri is not forceful. This is the first exception, the first controversy, that has ever arisen concerning the subject. I say that every consideration of justice, every consideration of honor and recognition of the obligations that ordinarily control men in public life, make it your duty and my duty, when we are voting away public money for the benefit of dependents of a deceased Congressman, to vote it to those who were dependent upon him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas. [Putting the question.] The Chair is unable to decide.

Mr. ROBINSON. I call for a division.

The question being put, on a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, if it is necessary, I want to give notice that the matter will be again brought up in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri reserves the amendment for a separate vote in the Senate.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of line 15, on page 20, the last clause read being as follows:

REPEAL OF APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORIZATIONS, MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

SEC. 2. That the following unexpended balances or portions of unexpended balances or combined or unexpended balances or combined portions of unexpended balances of appropriations for the support of the Military Establishment contained in appropriation acts or for fiscal years enumerated in this section shall be carried to the surplus fund and be covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act, namely:

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I understand that the items that now follow in the bill are the amounts covered back into the Treasury?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is correct.

The reading of the bill was resumed and concluded.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have been asked by a number of Senators to make a brief statement showing when the appropriations named in the pending bill are repealed and, taking into consideration the amount of the appropriations that were made for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, what the balance of appropriations would be. Briefly stated, it is as follows:

The total appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, amounted to \$36,119,536,082.75. The pending bill repeals items to the amount of \$15,400,186,239.38, leaving a net total of appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, after deducting this \$15,400,186,239.38, as provided for in this bill, of \$20,719,349,843.37. In the pending deficiency bill there is appropriated \$295,244,329.45, making the total appropriations, less the amount of \$15,400,186,239.38, \$21,014,594,172.82. That, Mr. President, is the total of the appropriations for the fiscal

year ending June 30, 1918, as they now stand. That, I will say, includes not only the direct appropriations, which are called "cash appropriations," but it also includes the appropriations which are authorized.

Mr. President, it is estimated that the expenditures of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, will be \$18,000,000,000. Upon that estimate will be based the amount of the next liberty loan; in other words, \$18,000,000,000 is supposed to be all that can be expended by the United States Government during the present fiscal year. So, Mr. President, there is no danger whatever in the deduction of these amounts from the amount that was appropriated for the year, for it will be noticed that, with all the repeals, there still remains appropriated \$21,014,594,172.82, or \$3,000,000,000 more than the actual estimates for the expenses of the Government for this year.

I will frankly admit that, when I first read over the bill and noticed the repeals, I thought perhaps in some particulars we were going too far; but I am now quite convinced that we could have gone \$3,000,000,000 further, and never in any way have interfered with the successful carrying on of the finances of our Government.

At the request of a number of Senators I have put these figures in concise form, so that anyone who desires to refer to them may do so without hunting for and figuring out the totals in the different appropriation bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and open to further amendment.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] has reserved an amendment for a separate vote in the Senate. The question is on concurring in the other amendments made as in Committee of the Whole. [A pause.] They are concurred in, without objection. The question now is on concurring in the amendment reserved by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, is the amendment which was adopted as in Committee of the Whole, on which I reserved a separate vote, now before the Senate for consideration?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is whether the amendment shall be concurred in.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, there are several Senators now present who were not here when the question was decided as in Committee of the Whole. Very briefly I have this to say—

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------|--------------|------------|
| Bankhead | Jones, N. Mex. | New | Spencer |
| Calder | Jones, Wash. | Overman | Sutherland |
| Cummins | Kellogg | Page | Swanson |
| Curtis | King | Pomerene | Thomas |
| Fletcher | La Follette | Ransdell | Trammell |
| Frelinghuysen | Lenroot | Robinson | Underwood |
| Gay | Lewis | Saulsbury | Vardaman |
| Hale | Lodge | Shafroth | Wadsworth |
| Hardwick | McCumber | Sheppard | Warren |
| Henderson | McKellar | Sherman | Watson |
| Hitchcock | McNary | Simmons | Wolcott |
| Johnson, Cal. | Martin, Va. | Smith, Ariz. | |
| Johnson, S. Dak. | Moses | Smoot | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on concurring in the amendment, made as in Committee of the Whole, found on page 19 of the bill.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, on page 19 the House of Representatives made an allowance of \$7,500 to the widow of Jacob E. Meeker. The Senate, in Committee of the Whole, changed the allowance from the widow and made it payable to the four children of Mr. Meeker by a former marriage.

The facts in the case are precisely these: Mr. Meeker was serving his third term in the House. He was divorced from his wife, who had borne him four children. His divorced wife and the four children are still living. Alimony, substantial in character, was awarded in that divorce proceeding and was paid.

Some months before Mr. Meeker's death—just how long I do not know—he had planned to marry a lady who was in his employ. The house in Washington was selected, the furniture was bought; and when, suddenly, sickness of serious character laid Mr. Meeker low and the doctors told him that death was near, in the full possession of his faculties he summoned Judge Garesche, of the circuit bench, whom I well know and with whom I have talked about this matter—and that conversation is largely the reason of what I am saying here to-day—who assured me that Mr. Meeker was in the full possession of his faculties and remained so for some hours afterwards; and

upon those facts he was married upon his deathbed to this woman, and he died seven hours afterwards.

Mr. Meeker's estate consisted substantially of \$33,000 of life insurance. And I ask particular attention to these figures, Mr. President, for in my judgment the crux of the whole matter lies here. Three thousand dollars of that total of \$33,000 of life insurance went to his former wife, besides \$8,000 of additions, making \$11,000 to his former wife; \$20,000 went to the four children. His present wife did not receive one dollar of it. The remaining \$10,000 was used to pay the debts of the estate, and his present wife did not receive one dollar of it. As I am informed, in addition to the life insurance, all that he had was an equity in a farm, heavily encumbered, of which equity four-fifths would belong to his children and one-fifth would belong to the present wife. So that we have this result: If this gratuity—for there is no law for it—of \$7,500 which the House has voted to the widow of this man is denied her, she goes out as the widow of the man without a single dollar, and the money which, by custom at least, has always gone to the widow, so far as I know, irrespective of the calendar arrangement of the marriage, is given entirely to the children.

I think that is unfair. I think that the woman, right or wrong, whom Mr. Meeker chose for his wife, and married, is entitled to the allowance which always has gone to the wife of the man upon his death.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as a number of Senators have entered the Chamber since this amendment was agreed to in Committee of the Whole, the amendment being reserved for a separate vote in the Senate, I feel it appropriate to state the grounds which, in my judgment, justified me in offering this amendment, and which I think make it our duty to concur in it.

This case is exceptional. It is perhaps the first instance in which a controversy has arisen in the Congress as to the payment of a gratuity to the dependents of a dead Congressman. There is no statute authorizing such payments. It is the custom to make these appropriations, and I think it has been the universal custom to make the appropriation to the widow. There is no wide divergence or difference as to the facts as stated by myself and the Senator from Missouri, as I understand him to state the facts.

Mr. Meeker and his former wife were divorced. By that marriage he had four minor children, the oldest being 17 and the youngest 5. Seven hours before his death, for the purpose of giving her the benefit of this gratuity, he married a lady who had been formerly a clerk in his office.

My position can be stated in a moment.

In voting public money to dependents of deceased Members of Congress it is the duty of Congress to make it available for those who were in fact dependent upon the deceased Congressmen. The undisputed facts are that the lady who is his widow did not occupy the relationship of wife to him; she was not dependent upon him; she earned her own living when she worked in his office, and she earns her own living now when she works in the office of another Congressman; but these children, who are flesh of his flesh and blood of his blood, are entitled to whatever gratuity Congress may see fit to bestow upon his dependents.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I only desire to say a single word about the practice of the two Houses.

It is an unwritten but very rigid rule that neither House should interfere with the appropriations made by the other exclusively for its own purposes. I have known one or two cases on a deficiency bill where an appropriation had been omitted by the House, and they would come in at the last moment, at the close of a session, and ask us to put it in; and that was done officially by the proper representatives of the committee. I think, Mr. President, it would be a very unfortunate thing to undertake to amend a provision of the House for one of its own Members on what is obviously a disputed question.

I am not going to discuss the merits of the matter, though I must say I think the case presented by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] is quite unanswerable; but that is neither here nor there. My sole point is that we ought not to take such a step as this, and I agree entirely with the Senator from Virginia on that point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole be concurred in? [Putting the question.] By the sound the yeas seem to have it.

Mr. ROBINSON. I call for a division.

On a division the amendment was nonconcurred in.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, is an amendment to this paragraph in order now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Any amendment is in order.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I move to strike out "\$7,500," at the end of line 7, page 19, and to insert in lieu thereof "\$3,750" and the words "and to his children \$3,750."

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator state that amendment again?

Mr. SHAFROTH. The amendment would give the widow \$3,750 and his children \$3,750.

Mr. President, if Mr. Meeker had died and this had been a part of his estate, in my State that would have been the exact division to which the persons who are next of kin would be entitled. In other words, in my State the widow gets one-half and the children get one-half. Inasmuch as this is a gratuity we have a right to apportion it in any way we deem proper.

As I understand, the matter was not the subject of discussion in the House. The question which has been raised by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] was not presented in any manner; and if this amendment prevails the conferees can examine into the matter more closely. But as we are making this appropriation for the purpose of giving to those who are dependent upon this man \$7,500, we can make no mistake, it seems to me, in giving to the widow one-half and to the children one-half. That is the way it would have gone to them, in the absence of any will, in my State.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Can the Senator tell me whether Congress ever has divided up these gratuities or whether they have always been granted to the widow?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know. I have not looked into that question. My impression is that Congress has made a change in some of the beneficiaries. What I mean by that is, if my recollection serve me right, they have in some instances given the gratuity to the executor or to the administrator; but I do not think there has been any action to change the beneficiary from the widow to any other person.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The cases the Senator has in mind were cases where there was no widow, and the gratuity went to the estate, were they not?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I think in another instance the children were made the beneficiaries when there was no widow.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not doubt that. What I was asking was, Does the Senator know of any case where there was a widow where the allowance was not made to her?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will say to the Senator that I have just heard of this matter within the last hour, and I have not looked up the matter at all. I do not know the precedents, nor do I pretend to, except from general remembrance of some things that occurred in past Congresses.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I will say that my experience on these bills has been that wherever there was a widow the fund has always gone to the widow, and where there was not a widow it has gone to the children, but never to anyone else aside from those who were dependents.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may ask the Senator a question, because his experience on appropriation bills is greater than mine, the question of dependency never arises at all, as I understand. The allowance is given to the widow or children whether they are dependent or not. They may have independent property.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Absolutely. Congress has never looked into the question of how much independent estate was left. It is a gratuity that has gone to the widow through all time, and when it subsequently turned out that there was no widow it went to the children, and that is all there is to it. To make any change in this respect would be an entire change of precedent.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it seems to me the method proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] is open to the same objection that I have made before. I think we ought to observe the usual relation of comity between the two Houses in a matter of this sort. Where the House has provided in its own way with reference to one of its own Members, I think we should be very slow to intervene in any way.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHAFROTH. If the Senator will allow me, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], in presenting this matter in Committee of the Whole, stated that he had been requested by a large number of Representatives to change this very item so as to give all of the gratuity to the children. By adopting this amendment the matter will be in conference, and the conferees can examine further as to what is the will of the House; but if the House provisions is concurred in there will be no opportunity to do so.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on that theory we should be obliged to make an amendment whenever a small minority of the House, or any handful of Members, came over here and asked us to make the change. This bill is the work of the majority of the House and of the majority of the committee that had it in charge. Unless we receive something from the Committee on Appropriations or from the House representing the majority of the House, I do not think we can undertake to meet all the objections that any small group of Members may desire to bring over.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, in stating the case a while ago, I think I said that this was the first instance in which a question had arisen in Congress as to the beneficiary in the granting of a gratuity to the heirs of deceased Members of Congress. My attention has since been called to the case of an Iowa Congressman, in which, at the instance of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], an amendment was adopted providing for a division of the fund so as to authorize paying a portion of it to the father of the deceased Congressman instead of paying all of it to the widow.

With respect to the point raised by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and by others that the adoption of an amendment changing the name of the beneficiary in a provision of this character originating in the House of Representatives would disturb the comity existing between the two Houses I desire to say that, to my way of thinking, that suggestion is totally without force. In the first place, the granting of a gratuity is not a matter of right. It occurs under a custom that has prevailed for a long time. In the next place, when Congress votes away public money it ought to vote it to somebody who is entitled to it; and if Congress sets the precedent which is implied in this case, in my judgment it will be acting unwisely.

The question was not raised in the House of Representatives. Whether or not it was discussed in the committee I do not know. Of course, under the rules it could not be officially known; but I do know that a number of Members of Congress—none of them, however, from Missouri—have discussed the question with me, and my information is that if the House had the opportunity it would not be averse to paying this fund to the real dependents of the deceased Congressman.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, do I understand the Senator to say that this matter was not an issue in the House in any way?

Mr. ROBINSON. There never was any question raised about it. The committee reported the provision as it is now in the bill, and there was no amendment offered in the House, and no discussion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was just a perfunctory proceeding?

Mr. ROBINSON. Just a perfunctory proceeding.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly.

Mr. SPENCER. Is the Senator aware that in the House there was voluminous correspondence about this very matter with the city of St. Louis and Judge Garesche to determine the mental condition of Mr. Meeker, and that there was a considerable inquiry in regard to the matter?

Mr. ROBINSON. I assume if the question was raised in the committee the committee made some investigation of it, although I do not know about that. I stated that the proceedings of the committee could not be officially known under the rules of the House of Representatives, but that no point was made upon the matter in the House of Representatives; that it went through in a mere perfunctory way.

As to the sanity or insanity of Mr. Meeker I do not raise any question. I made the statement myself that for the purpose of giving this lady the benefit of this provision, which would otherwise have gone to his children, in the presence of death, seven hours before it came, he married her, and upon that statement of fact, undisputed, I say that the decent thing for Congress to do is to pay the gratuity to the children.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask the Senator from Missouri a question. Did the Senator say there was some suggestion in the House in reference to Mr. Meeker's sanity at the time?

Mr. SPENCER. None with regard to his sanity, but the very fact that he died within seven hours after the marriage ceremony led to the query as to what was his real mental condition at the time, and therefore they wrote to Judge Garesche, who performed the ceremony, and whose reply was so satisfactory as to the clear mental condition of Mr. Meeker, both at the time of his marriage and for some hours subsequent to it, that it all vanished out of sight.

Mr. McKELLAR. But that question was raised?

Mr. KENYON. I wish to ask the Senator from Arkansas a question. He referred to an Iowa case. I have just entered the Chamber, and I do not know to what case he alluded.

Mr. ROBINSON. I am not sure myself, although the Senator from Iowa will recall the case in which a portion of the gratuity was paid to the father of the deceased Congressman on the motion of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. That was the case of Congressman Pepper. He left no widow, and the father was very much dependent upon him. I was told at that time that it was contrary to the usual custom, but it was so voted.

Mr. ROBINSON. There was a division of the gratuity.

Mr. KENYON. It all went to the father. There was no widow. Of course, I have always taken the position myself that we have no right to do this at all. I do not know what right we have to make a present of a year's salary to the widow.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I think it would be a mistake for the Senate to interfere with matters that concern the House and concern the House alone. We have always insisted on the part of the Senate in reference to our clerical pay, our contingent fund, our action here where money was expended for the benefit of the Senate, that only the Senate was responsible, and the House has taken the same position.

Two years ago, at the request of a number of Members who came over here, the Senate attempted to make, and did make, a vital change in reference to the clerical pay of the secretaries of Members of the House. Of course, when it went to the House and went to conference, the House conferees informed the Senate conferees that they could take their bill back; that they knew how to run their own business and proposed to do it; and the result is the conference committees on the part of the Senate of these appropriation bills have never heard the end of it yet.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think it is a fair comparison to which he has just referred with the situation which is now confronting us?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think it is a fair comparison.

Mr. KING. I make this suggestion to the Senator: Suppose the question should arise in the House of increasing the compensation of Congressmen to \$10,000 each per annum, would not that be a part of the business of the Senate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But that is a change of existing law. I am talking about what is purely a gratuity on the part of Congress. The Senate never attempts to define the gratuity for a Member of the House nor the House for the Senate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does not the Senator think there is this distinction between the two cases, that the matter of clerks' pay is a subject matter to be dealt with as having to do with the machinery of legislation in the House, the process of legislative business, whereas this is merely a matter of appropriating money to a widow, and has nothing at all to do with legislation?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to my friend this is a very much more dangerous proposition than for the Senate to interfere with the mere appropriation of money. This is purely a matter of sentiment based on nothing in the world but sentiment, that the family of a deceased Member shall be taken care of by the Congress.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. Why does the Senator assume that the House of Representatives would resent the Senate making a change in the beneficiary if the Senate thinks that that change should be made?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will tell the Senator why. I am informed since the Senator first brought this matter up—I did not have the information then—that the House committee went into this entire proposition and decided what they thought it was proper for the House to do, and the House accepted it; and I have no doubt the House, although it was not brought out on the floor of the House, understood the facts in the case, or many Members did, when the question was voted on.

Mr. ROBINSON. Now, let me call the Senator's attention to the case cited a while ago, and in this connection I want to get that case in the record right—the case discussed between the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and myself. In the case of deceased Congressman Pepper the House of Representatives refused, or failed at least, to make any provision whatever for the relatives of the Congressman, and this body wrote a provision in the bill, notwithstanding the oversight or failure or refusal of the House to make any provision, and that did not bring on any revolution either in Congress or anywhere else.

I must say to the Senator from Alabama, in view of the fact that the adoption of an amendment merely places the provision in conference, it seems to me absurd to say that the Senate is under the obligation to make an appropriation of \$7,500 in a case of this sort to a beneficiary that the Senate does not believe is entitled to it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, there is where the serious proposition comes in, one where I think the Senate is going to face a serious issue with the House. Mr. Meeker represented a district in Missouri for a number of years. He had a constituency which honored him with a large majority for a number of years. He had many friends in the House of Representatives. I had the honor to serve with him myself. He was a capable, sincere, and earnest public servant.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Just wait a minute, if the Senator will allow me. He died in a most heroic way. I do not know of any man under the dome of this Capitol who sacrificed himself more devotedly to public duty. The influenza was marching through this country carrying a swath of death with it greater than that from which our troops suffered in Europe. A camp near St. Louis had thousands of young soldiers down and dying by the hour, without nurses and without help. Volunteers were asked to come to the rescue, and this Congressman, valuing the cause of his country, went to the aid of these young soldiers and offered himself as a nurse. There he contracted the influenza that turned into pneumonia and caused his death. He was engaged to be married; the date was set; and under these circumstances on his dying bed he married the woman he was engaged to. When you fail to follow the vote of the House of Representatives and the precedent of the Congress and refuse to vote this money to the woman he left as his lawful widow, you put a blot forever on that woman's name and you strike at the man, the one man under the dome of this Capitol who gave his life to the young soldiers of this country and died a hero's death. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator think that any real true friend of Mr. Meeker would take umbrage because the Senate saw to it that his helpless minor children were given this gratuity? I think it is not entirely the widow who ought to be considered in this matter. I think the children have just as strong a right as the wife to our consideration.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that I myself was a friend of Mr. Meeker, though we did not sit on the same side of the Chamber.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was also. I liked him very much, and I indorse all the Senator has said about him.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He was my friend. I believe he knew what he wanted to do in this matter and, as far as I am concerned, I am willing to stand by him.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, what we have to do with it is simply to give the House, after the matter is brought to their attention, a fair opportunity to reconsider this question. It can be done by the adoption of this amendment. It can not be done if the amendment is not adopted.

If the House wants to insist upon it the conferees on the part of the Senate will unquestionably yield to the House, and under the rule which the Senator from Massachusetts has announced it probably ought to do so; but it seems to me, in view of what has occurred here this afternoon, and the fact that these minor children ought to be taken into consideration, a division of this money ought to be made, unless there is strong objection made by the House to it after a consideration of the entire matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH].

On a division the amendment was rejected.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. WARREN conferees on the part of the Senate.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13462) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is rather too late to go on with the bill this afternoon. I am going to ask, however, that the Senate shall take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I hope the Senator will not do that, because there are some matters pending here—particularly the resolution in reference to a conference report—that should be considered. If the Senator will promise to yield, so that those

matters can be taken up the same as if we had regular morning business, I will have no objection.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I would suggest that the Senator may not be able to yield for morning business without displacing his bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

OMAHA TRIBE OF INDIANS.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. From the Committee on Indian Affairs I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 3992) to investigate the claims of and to enroll certain persons, if entitled, with the Omaha Tribe of Indians, and I submit a report (No. 702) thereon.

This is a very urgent matter and is recommended by the Committee on Indian Affairs. Therefore I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendments were, on page 2, line 1, after the word "Barada," to insert "Phil Frost, Charles Frost, Leonard Frost, Frank Frost, Mary Frost, Sarah McCreary, Benjamin Peters, Emiel Peters, Frank Sailors, Edgar Sailors, Garlie Sailors, Bryan Sailors, and Edward Turpain"; and in line 10, after the word "Indians," to insert "Provided, however, That the enrollment of any of the persons named in this bill shall not be permitted to disturb or affect any allotment which has been made heretofore to the Omaha Tribe of Indians, or to any of them, nor to share in the distribution of any money now in the Treasury to the credit of such Omaha Tribe of Indians"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, directed to investigate the claims of Thomas Barada, Mitchell Barada, Waring Barada, Maggie E. Rockwell, Mart Peters Sailer, Celestine Barada, Kuhn, Margaret Kuhn, Josephine Kuhn, N. Edward Kuhn, John A. Kuhn, George F. Kuhn, Mary Kuhn, Stella Kuhn James, Barbara Kuhn James, Ethel Kuhn Ruthledge, Frank A. Peters, Jacob Peters, Frank E. Peters, Ernest C. Peters, Ruth Barada Sandage, Josephine Peters Mitchell, Pine Barada Beck, Toy Barada, Blade Barada, Nellie Barada Mott, Mary Barada Martin, Mrs. Era Barada Phillip, Mrs. Ada Barada Barber, Miss Alice Barada, William Barada, Walter V. Peters, and Job Barada, Phil Frost, Charles Frost, Leonard Frost, Frank Frost, Mary Frost, Sarah McCreary, Benjamin Peters, Emiel Peters, Frank Sailors, Edgar Sailors, Garlie Sailors, Bryan Sailors, and Edward Turpain to enrollment and membership in the Omaha Tribe of Indians; and if such investigation shows the persons named, or any of them, to possess Omaha Indian blood from a common Omaha Indian ancestor, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to enroll the persons named, or so many of them as possess Omaha Indian blood from a common Omaha Indian ancestor, with the Omaha Tribe of Indians and to accord to such persons so enrolled all the rights and privileges of any enrolled member of the Omaha Tribe of Indians: *Provided, however,* That the enrollment of any of the persons named in this bill shall not be permitted to disturb or affect any allotment which has been made heretofore to the Omaha Tribe of Indians, or to any of them, nor to share in the distribution of any money now in the Treasury to the credit of such Omaha Tribe of Indians.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FEDERAL BUILDINGS AT SANTA FE, N. MEX.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5516) to amend an act approved March 4, 1913, entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of the act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat., p. 875), as authorized the erection of a building for the accommodation of the post office and United States courts at Santa Fe, N. Mex., be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to require that said building shall be for the accommodation of the post office and other governmental offices, exclusive of the United States courts.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate adjourn until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 11, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10, 1919.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

John W. Troy, of Juneau, Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska, to fill an existing vacancy.

Malcolm A. Franklin, of Columbus, Miss., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 32, with headquarters at Honolulu, Hawaii. (Reappointment.)

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Joseph T. Carruth, of Idaho, to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho, his present term expiring January 24, 1919. (Reappointment.)

Dallas C. Weyand, of Colorado, to be register of land office at Glenwood Springs, Colo., his present term expiring January 19, 1919. (Reappointment.)

Edward J. Hoefnagels, of Colorado, to be register of the land moneys at Lamar, Colo., his present term expiring January 12, 1919. (Reappointment.)

Nathaniel Campbell, of Oregon, to be register of the land office at Portland, Oreg., his present term expiring January 21, 1919. (Reappointment.)

Alonzo L. Beavers, of Colorado, to be register of the land office at Lamar, Colo., his present term expiring January 12, 1919. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Robert J. McGrath, of Colorado, to be receiver of public moneys at Lamar, Colo., his present term expiring January 12, 1919. (Reappointment.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE COAST GUARD.

The following-named third lieutenants to be second lieutenants in the Coast Guard from the 7th day of June, 1918:

Earl G. Rose,
Edward H. Smith, and
Henry Coyle.

Third Lieut. Rae B. Hall to be second lieutenant in the Coast Guard from the 21st day of July, 1918.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENT, BY PROMOTION, IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Herbert Coleman Smith to be first lieutenant with rank from October 30, 1917.

PROMOTIONS IN THE PORTO RICO REGIMENT OF INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Urbino Nadal, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, to be captain with rank from November 1, 1918.

Second Lieut. Luis F. Cianchini, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, to be first lieutenant with rank from November 1, 1918.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Edwin A. Anderson, an additional number in grade, to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 28th day of November, 1918.

Capt. Charles W. Dyson, an additional number in grade, to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 16th day of December, 1918.

Commander Douglas E. Dismukes to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 15th day of August, 1918:

Edward H. Campbell and
Martin E. Trench.

Lieut. Commander Henry C. Dinger to be a commander in the Navy from the 26th day of May, 1918.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

James H. Comfort,
William V. Tomb,
George B. Landenberger, and
William Norris.

Lieut. Commander Harold E. Cook to be a commander in the Navy from the 23d day of July, 1918.

Lieut. Aubrey W. Fitch to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 20th day of March, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Robert V. Lowe,
John B. Rhodes,
Robert A. Theobald,
Guy E. Baker,
William F. Newton,
Frank N. Eklund, and
Willis W. Bradley, jr.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 23d day of July, 1918:

Earle F. Johnson and
Henry K. Hewitt.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Howard B. Berry to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1918:

Virgil C. Griffin, jr.,
Ernest G. Small,
Andrew C. Bennett,
William D. Taylor,
Robert R. Thompson,
Albert B. Sanborn,
Donald W. Hamilton,
George W. La Mountain,
De Witt C. Ramsey,
John H. Holt, jr.,
Marc W. Larimer,
Mahlon S. Tisdale,
Davis De Treville,
Nelson W. Hibbs,
Wentworth H. Osgood,
John H. Falge,
Hugh C. Frazer,
Baylis F. Poe, and
Ingram C. Sowell.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Francis E. M. Whiting,
Stanley G. Womble,
Charles A. Lockwood, jr.,
Charles S. Alden, and
Hubert V. La Bombard.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Leonard N. Linsley to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1918.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1918:

Arthur D. Struble,
Vincent H. Godfrey,
Donald MacL. Dalton,
Frank D. Wagner,
Armit C. Thomas,
John B. Kneip,
Marshall B. Arnold,
Irving R. Chambers,
Lloyd V. H. Armstrong,
Hubert E. Paddock,
Theodore E. Chandler,
Allan R. Wurtele,
Ryland D. Tisdale,
James P. Brown,
Edward Breed,
David McL. Collins, and
James M. Lewis.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1918:

William D. Sullivan and
Richard S. Bulger.

Medical Inspector Charles E. Riggs to be a medical director in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 15th day of October, 1917.

Medical Inspector Frank L. Pleadwell to be a medical director in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 8th day of January, 1918.

Surg. Benjamin H. Dorsey to be a medical inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 1st day of February, 1918.

Surg. Lewis H. Wheeler to be a medical inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander from the 1st day of July, 1918:

George C. Thomas,
Alfred L. Clifton,
George F. Cottle,
George B. Whitmore,

Glenmore F. Clark,
Joseph R. Phelps,
Chandler W. Smith,
William L. Mann, jr.,
John G. Ziegler, and
George A. Riker.

Dental Surg. Clark E. Morrow to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 3d day of July, 1917.

Dental Surg. Louis B. Lippman to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 30th day of July, 1917.

Dental Surg. Hyman Mann to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 16th day of October, 1917.

Dental Surg. Frank A. Zastrow to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 9th day of February, 1918.

Paymaster Eugene C. Tobey to be a pay inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 1st day of July, 1917.

Ensign Perry R. Taylor to be an assistant naval constructor in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 23d day of September, 1918.

Civil engineer Leonard M. Cox, an additional number in grade, to be a civil engineer in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 29th day of August, 1916.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists in the Navy from the 17th day of January, 1918:

Allen I. Seaman and
John Gallagher.

Pay Clerk Alexander C. Kozlowski to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 9th day of June, 1917.

Pay Clerk Benjamin H. White to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 15th day of January, 1918.

Pay Clerk Walter E. Morton to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 7th day of May, 1918.

Pay Clerk William J. Smith to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Pay Clerk Floyd J. Farber to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 14th day of August, 1918.

Pay Clerk Edison H. Gale to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 27th day of August, 1918.

Pay Clerk Herman W. Johnson to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 10th day of September, 1918.

Pay Clerk Percy J. Hutchison to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 11th day of September, 1918.

Pay Clerk Maurice T. Scanlan to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 12th day of September, 1918.

Pay Clerk Marcus E. West to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 13th day of September, 1918.

Pay Clerk John B. Daniels to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 20th day of September, 1918.

Pay Clerk Michael J. Dambacher to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 25th day of September, 1918.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Ernest C. Keenan, retired, to be a lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Harry C. Ridgely, retired, to be a lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy from the 4th day of December, 1918.

Passed Asst. Surg. Judson L. Taylor, retired, to be a surgeon with the rank of lieutenant commander on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named assistant surgeons on the retired list of the Navy to be passed assistant surgeons with the rank of lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Rice K. McClanahan,
Henry La Motte,
George M. Olson, and
Arthur C. Stanley.

Asst. Paymaster Jacob D. Doyle, retired, to be a paymaster with the rank of lieutenant commander on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named boatswains on the retired list to be chief boatswain on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Hjalmar E. Olsen,
Charles Wouters,
Lee R. Boland, and
William Johnson.

The following-named gunners on the retired list to be chief gunners on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Henry J. Tresselt,

Frank A. McGregor,
Vista R. Thompson,
Peter Hanley,
Humboldt J. Palmer, and
Theodore C. Wester.

The following-named machinists on the retired list to be chief machinists on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

James L. Baart,
August Anschuetz,
Herbert E. Kershaw,
Joseph J. Duffy,
Charles W. Jackson,
George M. Heinen,
John McPhee,
William P. Little,
Martin Casey,
William C. Dronberger,
William J. Powell,
Edwin J. Cuthrell,
James Wilson,
Peter J. Hanlon,
William E. B. Grant,
Daniel J. McCarthy, and
Thomas F. Hobby.

Machinist Harlan B. Heath, retired, to be a chief machinist on the retired list of the Navy from the 21st day of July, 1918.

The following-named carpenters on the retired list to be chief carpenters on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Benjamin D. Pender, and
Joel D. Griffin.

Sailmaker Herman Hansen, retired, to be a chief sailmaker on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Pharmacist William H. Huntington, retired, to be a chief pharmacist on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Pharmacist Isaac N. Hurd, retired, to be a chief pharmacist on the retired list of the Navy from the 14th day of September, 1918.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edward Crouch to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of August, 1918:

Daniel J. Sullivan,
Edwin W. Hill, and
Claude S. Padgett.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edward J. Carr to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 29th day of September, 1918, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously confirmed.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 5th day of November, 1918:

Thomas F. Morris and
Walter B. Buchanan.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 21st day of September, 1918:

Roy Childs,
Hardy M. James,
Patrick J. Sullivan,
William Crofut,
George H. Toepfer,
Luther C. Crow,
William Kasburg, and
Leo Kampman.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of December, 1918:

Frank McGlothien,
Wallace Hanna,
John C. Redman,
Frederick W. K. Mielke,
Ewell K. Jett,
Edward J. McCarthy,
Leslie W. Beattie,
Henry T. Hausten,
William McDade,
Robert H. Barnes,
Frank R. Wills,
Joseph R. Laing,
Charles D. Connor,
Roy M. Dyer,
William Province,

Joshua W. M. Simmons, and
Clyde H. MacDonald.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of December, 1918:

Bradford M. Melvin,
Eugene Bastian,
Marshall M. Angleton,
Victor A. Leonard,
Harold S. Vigab,
Frank Gawrych,
James A. Duryea,
Richard Tainter,
Ned P. Baugh,
William J. Clark,
George P. Hall,
Herman H. Roloff, and
Rudolph P. Bielka.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of December, 1918:

Linwood L. Curtis,
Otmar L. Olsen, and
Robert W. Ralston.

Ensign Arthur Bernstein of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be an ensign in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 8th day of September, 1918.

Paymaster Elijah H. Cope to be a pay inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 10th day of October, 1918, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously confirmed.

Acting Pay Clerk Samuel L. Bates to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 15th day of September, 1918, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously confirmed.

Asst. Paymaster James Wilson of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 15th day of November, 1918.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 15th day of December, 1918:

Claude C. Hanan,
Charles E. Leavitt,
Harrison W. McGrath,
Harry C. Mechtoldt,
Henry J. Taylor,
Charles W. Fox,
William S. Cooper,
Archie B. McKay,
Josephus M. Lieber,
George J. Schoonover,
Otto E. Matheny, and
Everett W. Brown.

The following-named assistant paymasters of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 15th day of December, 1918:

Forrest F. Fulton, and
John W. Mears.

The following-named officers to be assistant naval constructors in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 15th day of October, 1918:

Herman R. Newby,
Lott C. Newton, and
Goldsboro Sessions.

Carpenter Emerson W. Amos to be an assistant naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 15th day of December, 1918.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William N. Eichorn, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 15th day of December, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade), on the retired list, to be lieutenants on the retired list of the Navy, for temporary service, from the 21st day of September, 1918:

Alvah M. Smith,
Charles C. Beach,
Jesse E. Jones,
John Westfall,
Charles G. Wheeler,
William G. A. Schwerin,
Henry Feehan,
John L. Kelley,
Herbert J. Wiseman,
Edgar A. Robie,

Arthur Rogier,
Edmund H. Klamt,
William C. Stauffer,
Norman McIntire,
Daniel R. Shackford, and
James Munro.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 10, 1919.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Jouett Shouse to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

SOLICITOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

D. M. Kelleher to be solicitor of internal revenue.

SECRETARY OF EMBASSY OR LEGATION.

Clarence B. Hewes to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 4.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

John F. A. Merrill to be United States attorney, district of Maine.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate February 10, 1919.

POSTMASTER.

MINNESOTA.

Charles J. Hohenstein, Gibbon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, February 10, 1919.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who hast made us and the laws which environ us, open Thou our understanding that we may perceive and obey them.

Thus, as individuals and as a Nation, expand our intellectual, moral, and spiritual life; that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in us, as in Heaven; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 8, and the Journal of the proceedings of Sunday, February 9, 1919, were read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address delivered by my colleague, Mr. WILLIAM R. WOOD of Indiana, on the late Theodore Roosevelt, in my home city yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a speech made by Mr. WOOD of Indiana on the life, character, and public services of Mr. Roosevelt. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PROHIBITION AMENDMENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House communications from the following States, giving notification of the ratification of the prohibition amendment, for filing in the archives of the House:

Michigan, West Virginia, Iowa, Tennessee, New Mexico, California, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Carolina, Wyoming, Idaho, Illinois, and Missouri.

THE NAVY.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 35, noes 3.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, that is entirely too small a number to consider the vast increases in this naval program. I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] makes the point of no quorum. The Doorkeeper will